

*DR. SE-1*  
New Series

Volume II, Number 7

July 1951

# The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of  
English Literature and the English Language*

*Editor*

JOHN BUTT, B.LITT., M.A.

*Secretary*

LUCY HUTCHINSON

## CONTENTS

Raleigh's Last Speech: The 'Elms' Document. By R. H. Bowers	209
Quarto 'Copy' and the 1623 Folio: <i>2 Henry IV</i> . By Alice Walker	217
Dr. Johnson and Newton's <i>Opticks</i> . By A. D. Atkinson	226
Coleridge on Classical Prosody: An Unidentified Review of 1797. By George Whalley	238
Possible Indebtedness of Keats's 'Isabella' to the <i>Decameron</i> . By Herbert G. Wright	248

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A Note on the <i>Revelations</i> of Julian of Norwich (John Lawlor)	255
The Shakespearian Heroic Vaunt (J. M. Nosworthy)	259
Juliet's Days, Hours, and Minutes (J. C. Maxwell)	262
Robert Loveday: Commonwealth Man of Letters (Frank Livingstone Huntley)	262

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 8/6 net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 30/-

# The Review of English Studies

*Advisory Panel:* H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, M.A., D.Lit.; DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A.; SIR WALTER GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, M.A., D.Litt.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; F. P. WILSON, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

---

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

---

## CONTENTS (continued)

REVIEWS, ETC.: Piers Plowman. The C-Text and its Poet, by E. T. Donaldson, 268; Shakespearean Comedy, by T. M. Parrott, 269; Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and other Essays, by L. Hotson, 271; The Problem of *Henry VIII* Reopened, by A. C. Partridge, 273; George Chapman. The Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies, by J. W. Wieler, 274; Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Vols. IX and X, 275; A Strange Metamorphosis of Man, ed. D. C. Allen, 280; Biblical Criticism and Heresy in Milton, by G. N. Conklin, 281; Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition, by F. M. Krouse, 281; The Life of Reason: Hobbes, Locke, Bolingbroke, by D. G. James, 283; The Adventures of Lindamira, a Lady of Quality, ed. B. Boyce, 285; Tobias Smollett, Doctor of Men and Manners, by L. M. Knapp, 286; The Four Brontës, by L. and E. M. Hanson, 288; The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature, ed. J. E. Baker, 290; The Golden Nightingale. Essays on Some Principles of Poetry in the Lyrics of William Butler Yeats, by D. A. Stauffer, 291; English Poetry. An Illustrated Catalogue, compiled by J. Hayward, 293; English Studies 1949, ed. P. Magnus, 294; The London Book of English Verse, compiled by H. Read and B. Dobrée, 296; Short Notices, 297; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 300.



T  
cha  
exc  
gall  
an  
Lon  
pos  
of a  
cre  
dra  
issu  
sou  
ness

A  
alon  
to b  
with

R  
but  
man  
part  
ever

<sup>1</sup>  
Bon  
(repr  
a

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. II, NEW SERIES, No. 7

JULY 1951

## RALEIGH'S LAST SPEECH: THE 'ELMS' DOCUMENT

By R. H. BOWERS

I

THE cool and crafty officials of James I were well aware that the political execution of Sir Walter Raleigh on 29 October 1618 on a flimsy charge of treason risked the danger of overt protest on the part of those excited English subjects who were outraged at the sordid spectacle of a gallant public figure being 'sacrificed to the whim' of Spain. Accordingly an official anonymous *apologia* was quickly issued from the office of the Lord Chancellor to put the government's case against Raleigh in the best possible light. It is a skilfully argued indictment, albeit an obvious sample of special pleading, worthy of the pen of Francis Bacon who is usually credited with its authorship although it is more likely that he edited a draft drawn up by a member of his legal staff. At any rate, the document was issued from his office, and he was officially responsible for it. The tone sounded in the opening phrases is significant in showing a shrewd awareness of the value of propaganda:

Although kings be not bound to give account of their actions to any but God alone; yet such are his Majesty's proceedings, as he hath always been willing to bring them before the sun and moon, and carefully to satisfy all his good people with his intention and courses. . .<sup>1</sup>

Raleigh likewise did what he could to put his own case before the public, but he lacked the resources of the government. He did what a condemned man could: he made a last speech on the scaffold which is, for the most part, an amplification of his testamentary notes jotted down the previous evening while he was being held a prisoner.<sup>2</sup> Some modern scholars have

<sup>1</sup> *A Declaration of the Demeanour and Carriage of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight . . . Bonham Norton & John Bill, Printers to the King's most excellent Majesty*, London, 1618 (repr. in *The Harleian Miscellany*, London, 1809, iii. 368-87).

<sup>2</sup> Preserved in Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton, *Titus C vi*, No. 93; and pr. in Edward Edwards,

pointed out the items of special pleading contained in his speech: for example, S. R. Gardiner, the great historian of the reign of James I, wrote:

Every word he spoke was, as far as we can judge, literally true; but it was not the whole truth, and it was calculated in many points to produce a false impression on his hearers. On the commission which he had received from the French admiral he was altogether silent. . . .<sup>1</sup>

But most fair-minded scholars who have read the speech have remarked on its reflection of the courage and fortitude of a great Elizabethan meeting the supreme test.

It was natural that more than one transcription of Raleigh's last speech, along with a short account of the circumstances of its delivery, would have been made by friends, officials, or curious spectators. My attention has been called to two such transcripts preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library (bound in the *Rulers of England* series, vol. i of 'Elizabeth')<sup>2</sup> by Dr. Curt F. Bühler, curator of early printed books in that library. As far as I am aware, they have not been consulted or edited by any of Raleigh's numerous biographers. The purpose of the present paper, therefore, is to make available a diplomatic transcript of the so-called Elms document, which is the most complete and detailed version that I have seen; the so-called Fleetwood document is badly damaged, and defective in content. The manuscripts may be described as follows:

(a) The 'Elms' document. Two folios, measuring  $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8$  inches (311  $\times$  202 mm.). The watermark is similar to Briquet No. 12804, *pot à une anse*, used in 1588.<sup>3</sup> Paper browned. Written in a secretary hand which is turning brown. Obtained from a London dealer in 1905 by the Morgan Library. The ascription of authorship (or copyship?) to one 'Edmund Elms of Lilliford, clerk of the City of London', is pencilled in a modern hand on fol. 1 recto. I have been unable to identify Elms: Mr. R. E. Jones of the Corporation of London record office informs me that it was customary during earlier times for officials of the Corporation to employ clerks whose names do not appear in the records.

(b) The 'Fleetwood' document. Three folios. It measures  $12\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$  inches (306  $\times$  195 mm.). Watermark not paralleled by Briquet or Churchill, although the closest is Briquet No. 12866 which is lighter in structure: *pot à deux anses*. Cramped secretary hand, written in brown ink; paper browned. Obtained from a London dealer in 1905. The ascription of authorship (or copyship?) to Sergeant Fleetwood, Recorder of the City of London, according to an old pencil

*The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1868), ii. 494-5. A valuable study of the stance assumed by Elizabethan dramatic heroes at their moment of doom is that of Theodore Spencer, *Death and Elizabethan Tragedy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

<sup>1</sup> *History of England: 1603-1642* (London, 1883), iii. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Seymour de Ricci, *A Census of Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935-40), p. 1622.

<sup>3</sup> Charles M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes* (Paris, 1907), 4 vols.

notation, is erroneous since William Fleetwood, who had been elected Recorder in 1571, died in 1594.

There are two copies of Raleigh's last speech in the Public Record Office, No. 52 and No. 53 in vol. ciii of the state papers, domestic, of the reign of James I, rotographs of which I have been able to consult. There are two copies in the Tanner manuscripts at the Bodleian: No. 66 in Tanner MS. 74, and No. 9 in Tanner MS. 299 (Hackman, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, 1860, iv. 383, 702). One of these, evidently the item in Tanner MS. 299, was partially printed by Edward Edwards in his *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1868), i. 699-705; but he did not identify his source beyond stating that his transcription was taken from 'Archbishop Sancroft's copy'. Excerpts and short versions, whose sources are not clearly identified, are printed in the standard edition of Raleigh's works issued by the Oxford University Press in 1829 (i. 558-63, 691-6; viii. 775-80) which also contains the eighteenth-century biographies of Raleigh by Oldys (1736) and Birch (1751) in vol. i.

This listing of manuscripts does not pretend to be complete; there are doubtless other copies which have not come to my attention. Those which I have examined all show wide variation in content, to say nothing of phrasing and orthography, while retaining the main tenor of the speech. It seems impossible to establish any secure manuscript relation stemma or provenance. The Public Record Office copies, however, can be considered official; whether they are wholly accurate is another matter. I have not attempted to provide a commentary on the 'Elms' document for the good reason that I have nothing substantial to add to the eighty-one closely reasoned and documented pages which William Stebbing devoted to the second treason trial and subsequent execution of the 'last of the Elizabethans' in his authoritative biography of Raleigh printed at Oxford in 1891.

I agree with Stebbing that the interpretation of Raleigh's career is beset with 'insoluble riddles and unmanageable dilemmas', and that the relevant documents pose continual contradiction, charge and countercharge, allegation and statement so mixed with pleading, rumour, and prevarication that it appears virtually impossible to reach a fair and equitable estimation of the moral character of Raleigh. He could be the ruthless and cynical courtier, meshed in the political plots and counterplots of his strenuous day; he could also hold the generous and pious sentiments of a devout Christian, and dream the burnished dreams of the empire builder. Perhaps the traditional, if sentimental, estimate of his end, aptly phrased by James Thomson, is as true as any:

Nor sunk his vigour when a coward reign  
The warrior fettered, and at last resigned,  
To glut the vengeance of a vanquished foe.

29. October. 1618.

S<sup>r</sup> Walter Raleigh was ledd vpp to the Scaffold in the Pallaceyard by the two Sheriffs of London, accompanied w<sup>th</sup> doctor Toulson deane of Westm. The throng was great vpon his coming, and he was much pressed and crowded So as he was breathlesse and seemed faynting 5 vpon his arryving vpon ye Scaffold, But after he had pawsed a while, his spiritts seemed very cheerefull and his Countenaunce smyling, and he saluted divers of the Lords and others who were in his sight. The principall Lords were Arundell, Oxford and Northampton the Lo: Viscount Doncaster, the Lo: Windsor, the Lo: Sheffield who was on 10 horseback S<sup>r</sup> Edw: Sackvile, Generall Cecill, S<sup>r</sup> Henry Rich [etc.] his words were much to this effect.

I haue had theis two dayes two fitts of a fever, And yesterday I was taken out of my bed in one of my fitts, And whether I shall escape yt this day or noe I know not; yf therefore you perceyve any fainting in 15 me, ascribe yt vnto my sicknes rather then my selfe.

I am infinitely bound to God that he hath vouchsafed me this fav<sup>r</sup>, to dye in the light and not in the darke and in that Tower where I haue suffered so much aduersity and sicknes: Therevpon he told the Lords who were in S<sup>r</sup> Randolph Crewes window, that he wished his voyce 20 were so strong that they might heare him, who answered they would come downe to him, wherevpon the Earles of Arundell and Northampton and the Viscount Doncaster came vpp to the Scaffold where after seuerall salutacons he proceeded.

There be two mayne points, w<sup>ch</sup> (as I conceyve) haue hastened my 25 coming hither, and wherein his Ma<sup>tie</sup> hath bene informed against me, the first, that I had some practise w<sup>th</sup> ffrance; And the reason w<sup>ch</sup> his Ma<sup>tie</sup> had to beleue yt was for that when I first arryved at Plymouth I had a desire in a small barque to haue passed ouer to Rochell, and after because the ffrrench Agent came to my howse here in London: 30 But as euer I hope to see God, or to haue any benefitt or comfort by the passion of my Sauiour: I neuer had any practise either w<sup>th</sup> the ffrrench king, or his Embassador, or his Agent; neither had any intelligence whatsoeuer from thence, neither euer did see the ffrrench kings hand or his seale as some reported I had a Comission from him at Sea; 35 Neither as I haue a soule to saue did I euer know of the ffrrench Agent coming to my howse tille I see him in my Gallery. I come not here either to feare or to flatter kings: I am now the subiect of death, and the great God of heaven is my Soueraigne before whose Tribunall I am shortly to appeare; And therefore to speake falsly, as yt is a great

40 Sinne, soe to call God to be a witnes of an vntruth is a sinne beyond measure sinnfull: But to doe yt at the hower of ones death were the greatest madnes and sinne that would be possible.

The other matter alleagded against me is that I should haue spoken some disloyall dishonorable and dishonest words of the King; My 45 accuser is a runnagate frenchman, whoe having runn over the face of the earth hath no abyding place; This fellow because he had a merry witt and some little Skill in Chemicall medicines I enterteyned: he periured himselfe at Winchester in my former troubles, revealing that the next day w<sup>ch</sup> he vowed to the contrary to me the day before: But 50 by the same protestacon that I haue already made and as I hope for my inheritance in heaven I neuer spoke any disloyall dishonorable or dishonest words of the King: Nay I will protest and vow further, I neuer thought any such ill of him in my heart: And therefore methinks yt seemeth something strickt that such a base fellowe should receyve 55 credit against the protestacon I make vpon my saluation.

Touching S<sup>r</sup> Lewis Stukley, he is my Countryman and my kinsman And I haue this morning taken the sacrament w<sup>th</sup> m<sup>r</sup> Deane and forgyven both Stukeley and the ffrenchman, yet thus much I thinke I am bound in charity to speake of yt that others may take warning how to 60 trust such. S<sup>r</sup> Lewes Stukley had iustified against me before the Lords that I told him Lord Caroe sent me word to gett me gone when I first landed: I protest v[pon] my saluation, neither did my Lo: Caroe send me such word neither did I tell Stukley any such matter; ffor yf I had I presume he would not haue bene so careles to haue lefte mee as he 65 did afterwarde 8. dayes together while he was abroad in the country.

Secondly he iustified before the Lords that coming vp to London, on the highway, I shewed him a *letre*, that yf he would goe w<sup>th</sup> me into ffrance he should haue 10,000 $\mathcal{L}$ . God cast my soule into everlasting feyrfyel I named tenn thousand pounds ffor yf I had had halfe so 70 much I could haue made some meanes; Only I shewed him a *letre* and tould him there would be a course taken in his absence for paymt<sup>t</sup> of his debts: ffor my seeking to escape I cannot deny yt; I had advertisement from aboue that yt would goe hard w<sup>th</sup> me; I desired to saue my life: ffor that end I fayned myselfe sick at Salisbury to putt of the tyme till 75 his Ma:<sup>te</sup> nerer approach: Dauid a man after Gods hart, yet for safety of his lyfe fayned himselfe madd and lett the spittle falle downe vpon his beard, And I fynd not that yt is recorded as a fault in Dauid,—And I hope God will neuer lay yt to my charge as a sinne: But S<sup>r</sup> Lewes Stukley did mee a further iniury w<sup>ch</sup> I am very sensible of, howsoeuer 80 yt seeme not much to concerne mee: In my coming vpp to London wee lodged at S<sup>r</sup> Edward Perhams howse an auncient freind and followere

of myne and whose Lady is my wyves Cosin germane, There he made it to be suggested vnto me and he himselfe tould me hee thought I had some dram gyven mee I know yt much greeued the gentleman there 85 should be such a conceipt held And for the Cooke who was suspected having bene once my servant I know he would goe a thousand myles to doe me good.

ffor my going to Gwiana; many thought I neuer intended yt, but only to gayne my liberty (w<sup>ch</sup> I would I had bene so wise to keepe) But 90 as I shalle answer yt before the same God I am shortly to appeare before I intended and hoped thereby to haue inriched the king my selfe and my pardeners; But being crossed and vndone by Kemis a wilfull fellow who seeing my sonne slayne and me vnpardoned, would not open the myne but kylld himselfe.

95 And whereat yt was reported that I intended not that journey nor cared how yt sped, having already made my fortune thereby, and having 1600 £. in gold: As I shalle answer yt before the same God, I had not in alle the world either in my owne hands or in others to my vse, directly or indirectly, aboue one hundred peeces, whereof I gaue my wife when 100 I went 25 £. The Error I perceyve came in searching the Scrivenors booke, where they found the Bills of adventure arysing to a great some

And whereat his Ma<sup>tie</sup> also was informed that I was brought by force back by some of my Company, and came not voluntarily, nor submitted my selfe to the Kings goodnes in that respect; I doe protest 105 that when the voyage succeeded not and that I resolved to returne home, my Company mutyned against mee, and fortified the Gunners roome against mee and kept me w<sup>th</sup>in my owne Cabyn, and would not be satisfied except I would take a Corporall oath not to bring them into England, till they had gott their pardons, there being fower of them 110 unpardoned; So I tooke that oath being forced to come to them in the Gunner roome fför they would not come to me: Afterwards I wonne the m<sup>r</sup> Gunner who was the principall of them, and so the rest of them w<sup>th</sup> money, w<sup>th</sup> Cloathes, and wyne such as I had; So we came into Ireland, when they would haue landed in the north part, but I would 115 not because they were all Red Shanks, so came to the south hoping from thence to wryte to his Ma<sup>tie</sup> for their pardon; And in the meane tyme I offered to send them to seuall places in Devonshire and Cornwall to lye safe till they had bene pardoned But I am glad my Lo<sup>:p</sup> of Arrundell is here, fför when I went downe in my Shipp, his Lo<sup>:p</sup> and 120 diuers others being w<sup>th</sup> me after Salutacons and partinge his Lo<sup>:p</sup> tooke me aside and desired me faithfully and freely to resolute him in one thing w<sup>ch</sup> was whether I intended to returne home or noe what fortune soeu<sup>r</sup> I had I then tould his Lo<sup>:p</sup> and gaue him my hand what

soeu<sup>r</sup> succeeded yf I liued I would returne (w<sup>ch</sup> the Earle of Arrundel  
 125 (being present) iustified)

Other reports are raised of mee touching that voyage, w<sup>ch</sup> I value not  
 as that I would not allow the sick persons water inough: Those that  
 goe [on] such voyages know things must be done in order and propor-  
 tion; yf yt had bene gyven out by gallons, as some were sick, soe all had  
 130 perished: But theis and such lyke I passe by.

Only wil I will borrow a little tyme of m<sup>r</sup> Sheriffs to speake of one  
 thing And yt doth make my hart bleed to heare such an imputation  
 layd on mee It is sayd, that (beside that I was a prosecutor of my lord  
 of Essex) I stood in a window over against him when he suffered and  
 135 pufft Tobacco out in disdayne of him: God I take to witnes, my eyes  
 shedd teares for him when he dyed; And as I hope to looke God in the  
 face hereafter, my Lord of Essex did not see my face when he suffered;  
 ffor I was a farre of at the Armory, where I see him but he see not mee;  
 And my soule hath since bene many tymes greeued that I was not  
 140 neerer him when he dyed; because I vnderstood afterwards he asked  
 for me at his death to be reconcyled vnto me. I confess I was of a  
 contrary faction But I know my Lord of Essex was a noble gentleman,  
 and that yt would be worse w<sup>th</sup> mee when he was gone; ffor those that  
 sett vpp mee against him, did afterwards sett themselves against mee./

145 He desired alle very earnestly to pray for him ffor he sayd he was a  
 great Synner; of a long tyme, and in many kynde; his whole course was  
 a course of vanity: A Seafaring man, a Souldio<sup>r</sup> and a Courtier, The  
 least of theis were able to ouerthrowe a good mynd and a good man./

Then having ended his speech The Executioner kneeled and asked  
 150 forgyvenes, w<sup>th</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> he layd his hands vpon his shoulders and spoke  
 to him and forgaue him. Then he called to see the Axe, and putt his  
 finger on yt to feele whither yt were scharpe or noe: There taking his  
 leaue of some freinds, the deane of Westm<sup>r</sup> and the two Sheriffs, he  
 went first to one side of the Scaffold, and requested all that they would  
 155 pray hartily for him, and so turned to the other side and made the lyke  
 request to them there: Then gyving his hatt to one and his Capp to  
 another, The hangman threw his owne Cloake because he would not  
 spoyle the Prisoners gowne: And so layd himselfe along thereon; And  
 at two blowes the Executioner presently strooke of his head, his body  
 160 neuer shrinking nor moving: his head was shewed on each side, and  
 then putt into a red leather bagg; and his wrought veluett gowne cast  
 over his body, w<sup>ch</sup> was after conveyed away in a mourning Coach of  
 his Ladys./

## III

1.2. The name of Robert Touinson (1575-1621), consecrated Bishop of Salisbury on 9 July 1620, was also spelled Townson and Toulson (see *D.N.B.*). He had been installed Dean of Westminster on 16 Dec. 1617, and in this capacity attended Raleigh; his letter of 9 Nov. 1618 to Sir John Isham describing Raleigh's conduct is reprinted by Edwards, ii. 489.

1.62 and 1.128. There is a slight tear in the lower right-hand corner of the manuscript.

of  
see  
17,  
hn

of

## QUARTO 'COPY' AND THE 1623 FOLIO: 2 HENRY IV

By ALICE WALKER

IT has long been recognized that a number of First Folio plays were printed from quartos: *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Merchant of Venice*, *1 Henry IV*, *Much Ado*, and (with augmentation) *Titus Andronicus*, *Richard II*. In the eighteen-eighties, in his Introductions to the Griggs Facsimiles, P. A. Daniel advanced evidence that the Folio texts of *Richard III* and *Lear* were also printed from quartos, though, of course, with much correction. More recent opinion would include *Troilus and Cressida*.

The most interesting text for the light it throws on the preparation of copy for the Folio is *Richard III*. The Folio text of this play was printed mainly from a copy of Q6 (1622) corrected and supplemented by reference to a manuscript; for the rest (about one-sixth of the play), from III. i. 1-164<sup>1</sup> and from v. iii. 48 to the end, the Folio text was printed from Q3 (1602). The Q3 leaves had clearly been used to make good two substantial lacunae, and as these lacunae cannot be related to any damage a copy of Q6 might have sustained (such as the loss of whole leaves or damage to parts of a number of leaves) we must assume that the Q3 leaves had been used to make good lacunae in the manuscript. That this explanation is the correct one is supported by the fact that the number of variants between the Quarto and Folio texts from III. i. 1-164 and from v. iii. 48 on is much below the average elsewhere, clearly because there was no manuscript by which the Quarto could be corrected.

We have therefore to assume that at some time after 1602 (the date of Q3) and possibly before 1605 (the date of Q4), owing presumably to the loss of the prompt-book, the King's Men had recourse to an earlier manuscript which proved to be defective and was made good by incorporating the required leaves from Q3, with the intention of either preparing a new prompt-book or making do with this composite text. The implications of this shed an interesting light on the company's views of the Quarto text as a whole, for they must either have thought little of quarto texts in general as prompt-copy or of this particular quarto. The interesting fact for the present inquiry is what followed. This composite manuscript served as basis for the Folio text and the Folio copy was prepared by collating it with Q6. From this it might be supposed that this composite manuscript was

<sup>1</sup> References throughout are to the (Old) Cambridge Shakespeare.

the only manuscript of the play possessed by the company, that it could not therefore conveniently or wisely be spared, and that collation with Q6 seemed less laborious than making a transcript. But this appears not to have been the case, for when the collator came to the two places where lacunae in the manuscript had been made good by leaves from Q3 he apparently removed the Q3 leaves and inserted them in his copy of Q6. He can hardly have been daunted by the labour of transferring the few markings on these leaves to his copy of Q6 as the number of alterations to be made was so small. The conclusion seems therefore inevitable that the object of the collation was to supply Jaggard with printed copy. From the fact that the manuscript was again rendered defective by the removal of the Q3 leaves and, therefore, for practical purposes useless, it is clear that it could well have been spared as copy for the Folio.

The same laborious method of providing copy was employed in the case of *Lear*. It seems, in fact, to have been the customary procedure: witness the use of corrected quartos for the Jonson Folio and for later editions of plays which had undergone extensive revision (*Faustus*, *Mucedorus* and *Amadine*). In the face of the evidence of *Richard III* and in view of Jacobean practice in general, is there then any good reason for supposing that the Folio texts of *2 Henry IV*, *Othello*, and *Hamlet* were not similarly printed from quartos? A good reason would be that a copy of the required quarto could not be procured. This might, of course, have happened, but in general it would, I think, be safer to suppose that one edition was printed from another rather than to assume (as textual criticism of Shakespeare has tended to do) printing from different manuscripts wherever a typographical connexion is not apparent. I believe the assumption which underlies, for instance, Dover Wilson's words about the Folio text of *2 Henry IV* (that 'there is no need to posit the use of a quarto') has hampered investigation, and that some of the difficulties experienced in recognizing certain Folio texts for what they are, have arisen from failure to allow for conflation with a quarto. The lines of transmission of the F texts of certain plays are accordingly, I think, far simpler than they have been made out to be.

#### *2 Henry IV*

Opinion has fluctuated over the question of the relationship between Q and F of this play. Chambers and Greg inclined towards the view that a corrected copy of Q (1600) was used for F, but Shaaber's conclusion in the 1942 Furness Variorum edition that F was an independent print from a transcript (possibly by Crane) of the prompt-book has recently tipped the scales in the other direction. Shaaber's conclusion was accepted by Dover Wilson.

The significant fact which any theory of the relationship between Q and F must account for is the number of errors and anomalies they have in

common, especially in speakers' names. So far as I can see, these cannot be reconciled with Shaaber's conclusion that F was an independent print based on the prompt-book. My own conclusion is that Q was printed from foul papers and F from a copy of Q which had been collated with a fair copy of the foul papers, and that errors and anomalies common to Q and F were due to contamination of F by Q.

Among the common errors I would include the following (all emended by the Cambridge editors and Dover Wilson):

Ind. 35	hole <sup>1</sup>	for	hold
II. ii. 111	borowed	"	borowers
III. ii. 305	inuincible	"	inuisible
IV. i. 34	rage	"	rags
IV. i. 36	appeare	"	appear'd
IV. i. 180	At	"	And
IV. ii. 19	imagine	"	imagin'd
IV. v. 205	thy friends	"	my friends (or thy foes).

To these I would add the following where Q and F agree but are, I suspect, wrong:

- I. i. 151, *raggedst*. Theobald's conjecture 'rugged'st' is very attractive. It would not only give better sense in itself but would better anticipate the metaphor 'frown' in 152.
- I. ii. 7, *clay-man*. The Cambridge editors were, I think, right in rejecting this as a compound noun and in following Pope's interpretation of 'man' as in apposition to the phrase 'foolish compounded clay'.
- II. iv. 120, *filthy bung*. Innes's conjecture 'filch bung' (i.e. purse stealer), which the Cambridge editors recorded but did not adopt, seems to me right.
- IV. iii. 7-8, *the dungeon your place, a place deep enough*. The Cambridge editors followed Q and F, but Falstaff's trope should include the 'dale' and either of the conjectures they recorded ('the dungeon your dale' or 'a dale deep enough') would improve the sense.

Q and F have also some common anomalies (including some errors) in punctuation:

I. i. 183	venturd <sup>A</sup> . . . proposde,	for	venturd, . . . proposde <sup>A</sup> <sup>2</sup>
II. ii. 109-10	that (saies he) . . . conceiue	"	that (saies . . . conceiue)
II. iv. 49	off, you know to	"	off, you know: to
	(off: you know, to F)		
III. ii. 120	for th'other <sup>A</sup> sir Iohn	"	for th'other, sir Iohn
IV. i. 185	not, that if	"	not that: if
IV. iv. 84,	Bishop, Scroope	"	Bishop <sup>A</sup> Scroope
IV. v. 149,	Teacheth <sup>A</sup> this	"	Teacheth, this

<sup>1</sup> I give the Q spellings.

<sup>2</sup> I give the Q readings and those of F only if the punctuation differs from that of Q.

The third and fifth of the above readings are certainly wrong. The rest are anomalous and it looks as if F had followed the pointing of Q.

I find it difficult to believe that even if a transcriber anterior to the prompt-book was responsible for errors such as 'appeare' for 'appear'd' and 'imagine' for 'imagin'd' (and we must suppose this legacy of error had a long history to account for these errors in Q), two subsequent copyists let them pass unnoticed, since they make no sense in their context; and this is what we must believe on the supposition that Q and F were independent prints and F was printed from a copy of the prompt-book. Errors of this kind look much more like errors which originated in one print and were mechanically reproduced in another.

Even more difficult to reconcile with the view that F was printed from a prompt-book or a transcript of a prompt-book are its errors in speech prefixes. These are explicable if a copy of Q was collated with the prompt-book as errors in Q which escaped notice. They ought to have been corrected in prompt-copy. These include *Pistol* (Q and F) for *Shallow* at v. v. 17, 19 and possibly *Shallow* (Q and F) for *Falstaff* at III. ii. 148 (a conjecture of Theobald's but not accepted by the Cambridge editors). It is further remarkable that F failed to make uniform the speech prefixes for Gower as Messenger in II. i and preserved the Q variations: *Gower* (130), *Messenger* (163, 167), and *Gower* (177). It also (seemingly) failed to carry through its substitution of *Page* for Q's *Boy* and *Archbishop* for Q's *Bishop*. On at least one occasion F's solution to a problem present in Q seems more makeshift than one would expect of a prompt-book. From Q it is reasonable to infer that in II. ii the Prince was intended to read Falstaff's letter, with interruptions by Poins, and all that appears to be wrong with Q's speech prefixes is that *Prince* was omitted before 'I commend me to thee'. The omission resulted in consecutive speeches being assigned to Poins and in F we find the problem solved (but, I judge, wrongly) by the omission of the second speech prefix. This looks more like a compositor's work than a book-keeper's.

What seems of particular significance about the speech prefixes of F is that, although they are on the whole far more satisfactory than those of Q, they stand in a peculiarly close relationship to those of Q. Had F been printed direct from the prompt-book, one would have expected to find more uniformity and a more workmanlike solution to the problems presented by the foul papers (represented by Q); and had F been printed from a transcript of the prompt-book, one would have expected as well a fresh set of errors inaugurated by the prompt-book transcriber (such as we find, for instance, in *As You Like It*). There are in F no traces of such subsequent errors. From F's speech prefixes (clearly those of a later recension than Q) we must conclude either that the manuscript behind F

failed to correct and make uniform the speech prefixes of the foul papers with the thoroughness one would expect of either fair copy or prompt-book, or that F was contaminated by Q.

The spellings of Q and F tell the same story. F, like Q, preserves the anomalous spellings (iv. v. 32, 33) 'dowlny' and 'dowlne' (with an inorganic analogical 'I'). Elsewhere in the quartos and Folio the words appear (on twelve occasions) in the normal spellings and they are found in texts set up from foul papers (*Much Ado*), fair copy (1 *Henry IV*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*), Crane transcripts (*Tempest*, *Winter's Tale*), and prompt-copy (*Macbeth*). Why should these spellings have survived, exceptionally and independently, in Q and F of 2 *Henry IV*? There are, too, some identical spellings of common words which are difficult to account for except on the supposition (which I take to account for the survival of the 'dowlny' and 'dowlne' spellings in F) that F was printed from Q and the F compositor mechanically followed the spellings of Q: 'impudent sawcines' at II. i. 108, but 'boldnes' and 'impudent sawcinesse' at II. i. 119.

My interpretation of the evidence for the transmission of Q and F is as follows. Variations in speakers' names (e.g. Tearsheet, Doll, Dorothy, Whore) and lack of precision in stage directions ('an Officer or two', 'a Drawer or two') point to Q's having been printed from foul papers. The compositor clearly found them at times difficult to follow, probably for a number of reasons. Alterations in the course of composition may account for the difficulties at I. ii. 44-5 and I. iii. 79-80. We know that there had been some revision (which would especially affect speech prefixes) from the fossilized remains of Umfrevile and Oldcastle at I. i. 161 and I. ii. 114. In speeches of rapid prose Shakespeare seems to have left his intentions anything but clear, and there may have been some attempt on the part of the book-keeper to interpret his intentions. This may explain the confusion at the beginning of II. iv, where a speech prefix seems to have been interpolated for the more lethargic Drawer before 'Dispatch, the roome where they supt . . .', thus interrupting Francis's flow of instructions; the mysterious Will should presumably have entered three lines earlier with the news of Prince Henry's plot. Something seems to have gone wrong at the end of II. iv, and at v. v. 3-4 Dyce was probably right in suspecting the conflation of speeches intended for different characters. We find a speech prefix interpolated for Shallow at III. ii. 292 (possibly owing to confusion with the immediately preceding direction for his exit). A speech prefix for Lancaster is omitted at IV. ii. 67 and inserted (in place of Hastings) at IV. ii. 69. Greg suspected a book-keeper's hand in the direction for 'Alarum' and 'excursions' at IV. iii and the 'Retraite' at IV. iii. 23; and although the majority of the cuts in Q were clearly made for political reasons, a few near the beginning of the play (e.g. I. iii. 36-55) suggest that a start at least had

been made on shortening the play for representation. We can therefore see here the book-keeper's hand and there may have been at the same time some conjectural attempts to clear up ambiguities (e.g. at the beginning of II. iv and v. v). In general therefore the features of Q are such as to suggest it was printed from foul papers which presented many problems to the compositor.

F had clearly behind it a manuscript representing a later recension, but a fair copy of the foul papers rather than a prompt-book or a transcript of a prompt-book. With the exception of the errors and variations in speech prefixes already referred to (probably due to contamination later by Q), speakers' names had been corrected and made uniform. The foul papers' stage directions had been trimmed of superfluous information and supernumeraries (Falconbridge in I. iii, Sir John Russell in II. ii, and Sir John Blunt in III. i. 32), and of actors' names ('Sincklo' in v. iv). The names of characters in stage directions had been made to tally with speech prefixes, but the stage directions within the scenes had not the fullness that would be desirable in prompt-copy. This is noticeably so in II. iv with regard to Bardolph's movements, in III. ii (where Q but not F indicates the withdrawal and return of Falstaff and the Justices) and in v. iii with regard to Davy. There may have been some negligence on the part of the F compositor and/or on the part of the collator of the manuscript with Q, but the omissions seem too numerous to be put down entirely to carelessness in transmission, and they seem more characteristic of fair copy in which the foul papers had been reduced to order, but details such as would be necessary in a prompt-book had not been fully worked out. The manuscript behind F also preserved (seemingly) the full script of the play, again more likely in fair copy than in a prompt-book.

It is relevant to consider the character of the manuscript from which *1 Henry IV* was printed. This was clearly a fair copy of the foul papers in which (with the single exception of a Percy/Hotspur variation in IV. i) variations in speakers' names had been eliminated and in which speech prefixes had been brought into line with the names of characters in stage directions. The stage directions still needed clarification within the scenes (e.g. they fail to record the movements of Francis and Bardolph in II. iv and of Douglas in v. iv) and, although a line or two may have been lost accidentally, it was, seemingly, an unabridged version of the play. From the printing of this manuscript in 1598 we can deduce that it had served its theatrical purpose: namely, to provide a clear copy of the foul papers from which the prompt-book, plot, and parts could be prepared. It seems reasonable to suppose that a similar transcript of the foul papers of *2 Henry IV* was also made. The use of such a fair copy as the basis for F would explain F's outstanding features and rather especially (as a prompt-book would not)

its length. How necessary such a fair copy was would presumably depend upon the state of the foul papers, and in this case we may surmise that the book-holder's preliminary survey of Shakespeare's manuscript, which resulted in the supplementing of the stage directions at iv. iii, made it clear that it would be hazardous to proceed direct from the foul papers to the preparation of a prompt-book. Probably the manuscripts behind the F texts of *Richard III*, *Othello*, *Coriolanus*, and a number of other plays represented the same stage in transmission.

A feature of the F text of *2 Henry IV*, its so-called massed entries, has, I think, been exaggerated. Sporadically there do occur at the head of a number of scenes the names of characters who are not immediately required, but the characters are certainly not massed in the sense that they are massed in *Two Gentlemen*, and their entries are appropriately recorded later (as they are not in that play). These 'massed' entries seem more like book-keeper's jottings than even the beginnings of an attempt to refashion the stage directions on massed-entry lines. Why otherwise should they occur so sporadically and towards the end of the play rather than the beginning, which would be the logical starting-point for a revision? The substitution of Bardolph and the Boy for 'Sir Iohn Russel, with other' of Q looks like a misunderstanding. Westmorland's and Colevile's entry at iv. i is more curious. Colevile is not required until his encounter with Falstaff 400 lines later (in iv. iii), and if the iv. i entry was intended to cover iv. i-iii as a massed entry for a single continuous scene there is the notable omission of Prince John. Possibly Colevile was cast as the Messenger who enters at iv. i. 18 and his entry with Westmorland, who enters at iv. i. 25, was a 'Be ready' jotting. Alternatively, Colevile may have been a substitution for Lord Bardolph whose entry is recorded in Q. But this still leaves Pistol's entry at v. iii unexplained. For the rest, Warwick's entry at iv. v. 225 is natural and so, too, is Davy's at v. i. They were doubtless intended to enter with the throng and to come forward when addressed.

If these so-called massed entries had been found in Q they would have been readily explicable, since Shakespeare not infrequently included in the direction at the head of a scene more characters than he immediately made use of and worked them in (or failed to work them in, as in the case of Falconbridge) as he went along. There is an example of this in Q at v. ii where Gloucester, Lancaster, and Clarence appear both in the scene heading and in the direction at v. ii. 13. Possibly Q preserved this Shakespearian legacy in one place and F in another, but on the evidence of the substitution of Bardolph for Russell at ii. ii, which suggests a book-keeper working with the precedent of *1 Henry IV* before him, I am inclined to see the book-keeper's hand at iv. i and possibly a legacy from the foul papers at v. iii. Though one would wish to fit these stage directions into the picture

less tentatively, they should not, I think, be allowed to distort the features of the F text as a whole, which are those of fair copy much like that which served for *1 Henry IV*.

Once the relationship between the manuscripts underlying Q and F is recognized it is, of course, easier to see how, given this closer connexion between them, errors common to Q and F might have originated in the foul papers, been reproduced in the fair copy, and have found their way independently into print. But if we believe the foul papers to have been in Shakespeare's hand, we have then to assume that the compositor of Q and the fair-copy scribe independently made the same mistakes in reading the foul papers—and whoever made the fair copy was presumably acquainted with Shakespeare's writing. There is the same difficulty in explaining mistakes in punctuation. Either Shakespeare punctuated his manuscript incorrectly and a legacy of errors survived in the fair copy, or the Q compositor and the fair-copy scribe independently misunderstood the sense. In view of the very bad pointing of *Much Ado* (which was printed from foul papers by the same printer immediately after Q of *2 Henry IV*) it seems more likely that these errors of judgement were made in the printing-house and were a legacy in F from Q.

The only alternative to supposing that the errors common to Q and F originated in Q is to suppose that Q was printed not from Shakespeare's foul papers but from a transcript of them, and that it was in this transcript that the common errors originated and from this transcript that the fair copy was made. There is an occasional indication in Q, more particularly in the speakers' names, that parts at least of the foul papers may have been copied: at the beginning of II. iv and v. v, for instance, and, more particularly, at IV. ii. 67, 69. Though it is a little difficult to see how anyone but Shakespeare could (or would) have been responsible for the tidying up of his preliminary work and Q's errors and confusions are explicable in the light of the additions to the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript, the possibility of transcription must be considered. We cannot assume that this transcript was made in 1600 for publication: it was the company's normal practice to part with the foul papers themselves and in an exceptional case (*1 Henry IV*) they parted with fair copy: in any case, a transcript made in 1600 could more easily have been made from the fair copy than the foul papers. Further, since on this theory we are assuming that errors in the transcript contaminated the fair copy, the transcript must have dated from about the time of the play's composition and it cannot therefore have been made for publication in 1600. But even if we assume that there were two sets of foul papers, the first in Shakespeare's hand, the second a transcript from which Q was printed and the fair copy made, this will not account for F's failure to correct and make uniform the variations in speakers' names.

In fair copy these should have been eliminated with something like the thoroughness we find in Q of *1 Henry IV*. There can hardly have been two transcripts of the original manuscript (one, the postulated transcript, presumably doing a little preparatory tidying up, and the second, the fair copy, still failing to get all in order). The supposition that a transcript of the foul papers was the source of the common errors and anomalies in Q and F does not, I think, help and is unnecessary. The source of contamination must therefore have been subsequent to the preparation of the fair copy, and therefore in Q.

For these reasons I believe that what was done in the case of *Richard III* was done in the case of *2 Henry IV*: that a manuscript was collated with a copy of Q in order to provide Jaggard with printed copy and that this manuscript was a fair copy of the foul papers (represented by Q). Consequently, readings common to Q and F may have only a single authority behind them and, although the authority is a good one, the text is, I think, more open to reasonable emendation than has been thought.

In conclusion, I should add that I do not think that the elimination of oaths from the Folio is solely to be associated with prompt copy. After 1606 it would presumably have been imprudent not to purge of profanity any manuscript submitted or re-submitted for licence, but there is another consideration which may have a bearing on this matter. Broadly, the dividing line between plays from which profanity was not expurgated and those from which it was lies between the Comedies and the Histories. This corresponds with the break in the printing of the Folio on which work was begun in 1621 and resumed with *Richard II* in the spring of 1623. In this interval Buc had resigned his office as Master of the Revels and it looks as if whoever prepared the copy for Jaggard anticipated a more rigorous attitude towards profanity in plays from Buc's successor. This might account for the thorough elimination of oaths from *1, 2 Henry IV* but not, for instance, from *Much Ado*.

## DR. JOHNSON AND NEWTON'S OPTICKS

By A. D. ATKINSON

### I

IMPORTANT work has recently been done on the influence of Newton on the poetry and thought of the eighteenth century.<sup>1</sup> This paper attempts, by an examination of Newtonian quotations in the *Dictionary*, to show the degree and nature of Johnson's use of the *Opticks*. In addition, it is suggested that a survey of relevant authors to illustrate the state of optical studies in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries provides interesting indications of Johnson's reading in this subject.

So far as I am aware, the copy of the *Opticks* which Johnson must have used in the preparation of the *Dictionary* has never been discovered, although he is known to have possessed several volumes of Newton's works.<sup>2</sup> With knowledge of his methods available, however,<sup>3</sup> it is possible to follow his reading quite closely through not only the *Opticks* but also a number of other related books.<sup>4</sup>

### II

'After astronomy, the science which made most progress in the seventeenth century was optics.'<sup>5</sup> Johnson's scientific reading seems to have been drawn mainly from the seventeenth century.<sup>6</sup> The significant studies before

<sup>1</sup> Notably by Basil Willey, *The Eighteenth Century Background* (London, 1946); Marjorie Nicolson, *Newton Demands the Muse* (Princeton, 1946); A. D. McKillop, *The Background of Thomson's 'Seasons'* (Minneapolis, 1942); W. K. Wimsatt, *Philosophic Words* (New Haven, 1948) and, to some extent, *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson* (New Haven, 1941).

<sup>2</sup> A Catalogue of the Valuable Library of Books . . . belonging to Johnson at his death (1785; facsimile, London, 1892) includes the following items: 58 *Newtoni optice*; 289 *Newtoni philosophia &c. Cant. 1713 &c.*; 538 *Newton's chronology, &c.* The first of these may have been the 1706 publication, *Latine reddidit S. Clarke*.

<sup>3</sup> For general methods, cf. Hawkins, *Life* (London, 1787), p. 175, and Boswell, *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell (Oxford, 1934), i. 188. Johnson's copies of Shakespeare and South's *Sermons* are described by A. Cuming, 'A Copy of Shakespeare's Works which formerly belonged to Dr. Johnson', *R.E.S.* iii (1927), 208-12, and J. E. W. Wallis, *Dr. Johnson and his English Dictionary* (Lichfield, 1946), pp. 15-18. The 1740 edition of Bacon's *Works* used by Johnson is in the Library of Yale University, and Wimsatt reproduces a page from it as frontispiece to his *Philosophic Words*. The British Museum possesses a copy of Watts's *Logick* (8th edit., 1745) (C. 28. g. 9) with the inscription 'Dr. Johnson's copy, marked for his Dictionary. Bought at his sale by Mr. Rogers, and by him given to me, 30 Oct. 1842. Samuel Sharpe.'

<sup>4</sup> All references in this article are to the reprint of the 4th edit. (1730) of the *Opticks* (London, 1931), and to the 1st edit. of the *Dictionary* (1755). Other editions of the latter—the 4th (1773) and the 6th (1785), and the first abridgement (1756)—have also been consulted, and are specified where appropriate.

<sup>5</sup> Jeans, *The Growth of Physical Science* (Cambridge, 1947). See pp. 200-12.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the present writer's 'Dr. Johnson and Science', *N. & Q.*, cxcv. 140.

Newton's *Opticks* (1704)—Kepler's *Dioptrice* (1611), J. Gregory's *Optica Promota* (1663), Grimaldi's *Physico-Mathesis de Lumine, Coloribus, et Iride* and Hooke's *Micrographia* (both 1665), Barrow's *Lectiones* (1669), Huygens' *Traité de la Lumière* (1690), and D. Gregory's *Catoptricae et Dioptricae Sphaericae Elementa* (1695)—being written in Latin or French, would not have provided quotable material for an English Dictionary. The sources Johnson did use are mentioned below, but perhaps it is worth mentioning that he does not seem to have used two relevant books<sup>1</sup> which appeared in English before publication of the *Dictionary*—Berkeley's *Essay towards a New Theory of Vision* (1709) and Robert Smith's *Compleat System of Opticks* (1738).<sup>2</sup>

The following selection of words is given, partly to indicate the range of optical terms covered by the *Dictionary*, partly to show Johnson's sources. The names in brackets denote the authorship of illustrative quotations appended to the definitions: quotations from poets have been ignored, and only those prose-writers are mentioned who appear to have provided Johnson with 'technical' information.

Among the terms having general reference to this subject are:

*light* (Newton, Dryden); *daylight* (Newton); *vision* (Newton—2); *visual* (Bacon); *visibility* (Boyle); *visible* (Bacon); *dioptrical* (Boyle, More); *optical* (Boyle); *optick* (Newton, Wotton); *lucid* (Ray, Newton); *luciferous* (Boyle); *lucifick* (Grew); *luminous* (Bacon, Bentley, Newton); *opacate* (Boyle); *opacity* (Browne, Ray, Newton); *opacous* (Digby); *opaque* (Cheyne); *pellucid* (Woodward, Newton); *transparency* (Arbuthnot); *glaze* (Dryden); *micrography* (Grew); and *opticks* (Browne, Cheyne).

Words concerning the behaviour of light are:

*ray* (Newton); *radiate* (Locke); *radiation* (Bacon); *dilate* (Newton); *converge* (Newton); *diverge* (Newton); *focus* (Newton); *incidence* (Newton—2, Bacon); *magnify* (Locke); *parallax* (Newton); *penumbra* (Newton); *reflection* (Cheyne); *reflexibility* (Newton); *reflexible* (Cheyne); *refract* (Cheyne—2); *refraction* (Harris, Newton); *refractive* (Newton); *refrangibility* (Newton); *refrangible* (Locke); *unrefracted* (Newton); *halo* (Newton—2); *iris* (Newton); (rain)bow (Newton).

<sup>1</sup> Johnson's library included (*Catalogue, supra*):

181 *Ferguson's lectures*—astronomy—introduction to astronomy—perspective. (Ferguson's books included *Astronomy explained on Sir Isaac Newton's Principles*, 1756: *Lectures on Select Subjects in Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Pneumatics, and Optics*, 1760: and *The Art of Drawing in Perspective made easy to those who have no previous knowledge of the Mathematics*, 1775. It is interesting to note that Ferguson died at No. 4 Bolt Court on 16 Nov. 1776: Johnson moved into No. 8 in March of the same year.)

276 *Taylor's method of perspective*.

351 *Barrow's works*, 4 v.

<sup>2</sup> Although the *Compleat System* gives what is probably the best picture of the state of optical studies at this date, it is a text-book pure and simple, of little literary merit. It would have been surprising if Johnson had used it for the *Dictionary*.

Words connected with glass and optical instruments are represented by:

*glass* (Peacham, Boyle); *vitreous* (Ray); *vitrification* (Bacon, Boyle); *vitrify* (Bacon); *window* (Newton); *glass-grinder* (Boyle); *lens* (Newton—2); *concavo-convex* (Newton); *convex* (Dryden); *convexity* (Newton, Bentley); *convexo-concave* (Newton); *planoconvex* (Newton); *eyeglass* (Newton); *spectacles* (Bacon, Dryden, Grew, Newton); *objectglass* (Newton); *prism* (Newton); *prismatically* (Boyle); *perspective* (Bacon); *reflector* (Boyle); *speculum* (Boyle); *specular* (Boyle, Newton); *microscope* (Bentley); *telescope* (Watts).

Names of parts of the eye and of defects of vision include:

*eye* (Bacon, Newton); *pupil* (Bacon, Ray, More, Newton); *araneous* (membrane) (Derham); *crystalline humour* (Ray); *sclerotic* (Ray); *vitreous* (humour) (Ray); *uveous* (Ray); *cataract* (Bacon); *glaucoma* (Sharp); *ophthalmic* (Sharp); *shortsighted* (Newton); *squint* (Bacon).

General words dealing with colour are:

*spectrum* (Newton); *chromatic* (Dryden); *colorate* (Ray); *coloration* (Bacon—2); *colorific* (Newton); *colour* (Watts, Newton); *to colour* (Newton); *coloured* (Bacon); *colourist* (Dryden); *colourless* (Newton, Bentley); *pigment* (Boyle); *shade* (Locke); *shadow* (Peacham, Dryden); *tinct* (Bacon—2, Browne, Boyle); *tincture* (Wotton, Watts); *tinge* (Newton—2); *tingent* (Boyle).

Colour-words are well illustrated with quotations drawn from Newton (*azure, black, blackness, blue, dun, gray, green, greenish, red* (2), *rubiform, rubrick, russet, white* (2), *whiteness, yellow*); Boyle (*blackish, blueness, bluishness, cerulean, crimson, purplish, reddishness, sapphirine, yellowishness*); Woodward (*beryl, brownish, emerald, purple, sapphire, yellowish*); Peacham (*roset, saffron, tawny, umber, vermillion*); Hill (*cochineal, emerald, lapis-lazuli, ochre*); Locke (*blackness, orange, violet*); Bacon (*scarlet, vermillion, yellowness*); Grew (*cerulifick, rubifick*); Browne (*jetty, tawny*); Dryden (*pink, ultramarine*); Watts (*green*); and Arbuthnot (*yellowness*). A few samples of words describing the qualities of colours might be added:

*light* (Dryden); *perspicuous* (Peacham); *resplendent* (Newton); *splendent* (Newton); *twinkle* (Newton); *dusky* (Woodward, Newton); *faint* (Newton—2); *indistinctly* (Newton); *indistinctness* (Newton); *vivid* (Boyle, Newton); and *vividly* (Boyle).

Although Johnson took quotations to illustrate 'optical' words from a miscellany of authors, there can be little doubt that he relied most on Newton.<sup>1</sup> The selection of words listed above carried with them 200

<sup>1</sup> Fifty-two words in the *Dictionary* are illustrated solely by quotations from Newton. These include, as might be expected, words such as *colorific*, *convexo-concave*, *fissile*, *fluor*, *focus*, *fusion*, *halo*, *lens*, *objectglass*, *obliquation*, *penumbra*, *planoconvex*, *pression*, *quicksilvered*, *refractive*, *resublime*, *rubiform*, *spectrum*, *synthesis*, *tripoly*, and *unrefracted*.

quotations of a technical nature, and of these 75 come from Newton. Boyle is second with 26, Bacon third with 20, and none of the other writers provided more than 10 contributions.<sup>1</sup>

## III

I have noted 461 Newton quotations<sup>2</sup> in the *Dictionary*. Without exception they can all be found in the *Opticks*. It is known that the fourth edition of the *Dictionary* (1773) differs from the earlier editions in its literary and artistic quotations. A comparison of the first hundred pages of the fourth edition with the equivalent pages of the first shows certain differences in respect of the scientific material. 1773 has approximately 35 additional quotations of this nature—13 from Browne,<sup>3</sup> 5 from Bacon, 4 from Glanvill,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The other figures are Dryden, 10; Ray, 9; Woodward and Peacham, 8 each; Locke, 7; Cheyne, 6; Grew and Browne, 5 each; Bentley, Watts, and Hill, 4 each; More, Arbuthnot, and Wotton, 2 each; Digby, Harris, and Derham, 1 each. The books in question include:

Boyle, *Experiments and Considerations Touching Colours* (1663).

Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum: or A Natural History* (1627).

Dryden, *De Arte graphica: The Art of Painting* (transl. from Du Freanoy) (1695).

Ray, *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation* (1691).

Woodward, *An Essay toward a Natural History of the Earth* (1695): *An attempt towards a Natural History of the Fossils of England* (1728–9): *Fossils of all kinds digested into a Method* (1728).

Peacham, *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622).

Locke, *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding* (1690).

Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* (1705).

Grew, *Museum Regalis Societatis* . . . (1681).

Watts, *Logick* (1725).

Browne, *Vulgar Errors* (1646).

Hill, *A History of the Materia Medica &c.* (1751).

The above dates are of first publication: no attempt is made to indicate later—sometimes enlarged—editions possibly used by Johnson. It is known that he used the 1745 edit. of Watts and a 1740 edit. of Bacon—cf. *supra*—and 1661 edit. of Peacham. Some of the above books (together with others which may have helped him) are listed in the *Catalogue*, e.g.:

23 Woodward's history of fossils.

30 Boyle's works.

272 Hill's *materia medica*.

276 Taylor's method of perspective.

331 Fresnoy's art of painting.

358 Grew's *cosmologia sacra* 1701, &c.

579 Browne's *vulgar errors*.

601 Locke's works.

But it must be remembered that the *Catalogue* lists what he owned at his death: some might well have been acquired after the *Dictionary* was finished.

<sup>2</sup> This figure does not include the 'Newton' quotations illustrating *adaptness* (first appearance, 1773), *flatter*, and *Urim*, which come from Thomas Newton's preface or notes to his 1749 edition of Milton. The quotation under *patient* probably comes from this other Newton, too (born, like Johnson, at Lichfield).

<sup>3</sup> Almost all, I think, from the *Vulgar Errors*.

<sup>4</sup> *Scepsis Scientifica*, the 2nd edit. (1665) of *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (1661).

4 from Harvey,<sup>1</sup> 3 from Boyle, and a few odd ones from Ray, Locke, &c. The additional quotations occasionally illustrate new senses of words already defined in 1755—e.g. *abstract* (2), ‘to separate by distillation’; *air* (4), ‘scent; vapour’; *to arch* (3), ‘to form into arches’. ‘Philosophical’ words appearing (with appropriate quotations) for the first time in these pages of the fourth edition include *aggelation* (‘concretion of ice’), *alimentally*, *analogal*, *angour* (‘pain’), and *anthropomorphite*. Not all the changes were by way of addition or enlargement. The description of *alum* (taken from Chambers) is 182 words shorter in 1773: other examples of similar abbreviation are *amber* (cut from 36 lines to 28 lines), *ambergris* (from 36 to 28 also), *amethyst* (from 15 to 9), *ammoniac* (from 52 to 41), and *antimony* (from 33 to 22).

The differences between the first and fourth editions hardly affect the Newton element. Four hundred and sixty of these quotations appeared when the *Dictionary* was first published: I have noticed only one—that illustrating *circle*—as a new-comer in 1773.<sup>2</sup> The text of the Newton extracts is substantially the same in both editions—in a very small number of instances the 1755 quotations are a few words longer (e.g. *alkalizate*, *close with*, *curl*, *decrease*, *define*, *inequality*, *sideways*). It may be remarked, in passing, that the first abridged edition, 1756 (which omitted the quotations themselves) often includes Newton among the two or three authorities selected, often from quite a number.

The Newton quotations, then, appeared in the first edition of the *Dictionary*. It is not certain which edition of the *Opticks* Johnson used. The second edition, 1718, omitted the ‘Mathematical Tracts’ subjoined to the first: and the Advertisement states, ‘At the End of the Third Book I have added some Queries. . . .’ The texts of the three octavo editions, the second, third (1721), and fourth, are similar. The fourth edition, 1730, was ‘carefully printed from the Third Edition, as it was corrected by the Author’s own Hand, and left before his Death with the Bookseller’.<sup>3</sup> Whichever edition Johnson read, it could not have been the first, which ended three-quarters of the way through Query 16 (as this Query stands in the later editions): and (cf. *infra*) Johnson quoted extensively from Queries 17–31 and the remainder of the enlarged text. (Under *author*, for example, he quoted an abbreviated version of the very last sentence of the extended *Opticks*.)

For the sake of comparison, I append the following small table of total numbers of quotations found in the *Dictionary* taken from the *Opticks*,

<sup>1</sup> *Morbus Anglicus, or the Anatomy of Consumptions* (1666).

<sup>2</sup> It had, however, already appeared in 1755 in illustration of *orbicular*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. J. Gray, *A Bibliography of the Works of Sir Isaac Newton* (Cambridge, 1907). In addition, copies of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th editions of the *Opticks* have been inspected.

Addison's *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy* (a book which he was inclined to disparage),<sup>1</sup> Knolles's *Generall Historie of the Turks* (somewhat of a favourite of his),<sup>2</sup> and Watts's *Logick* (another book he liked, to which reference has been made in an earlier footnote). The figures are:

Newton	:	:	:	461 (460 in 1st edition)
Addison	:	:	:	655* <sup>3</sup>
Knolles	:	:	:	434* <sup>4</sup>
Watts <sup>5</sup>	:	:	:	478*

\* Figures marked with an asterisk are based on the 6th edit. of the *Dictionary*, which reproduced (with some printer's errors) the text of the revised 4th edit.

By listing the quotations from the *Opticks* and identifying them in their contexts, a useful idea can be obtained of Johnson's dictionary-making methods. Clearly as a labour-saving device, he quite often used substantially the same quotation for more than one word. Forty-four *Opticks* quotations are used twice, and 4 (*dissimilar, heterogeneal, homogeneal*, p. 4; *curl, vein, wave*, p. 41; *dun, dusky, strong*, p. 150; *fragment, plate, slit*, p. 251), three times. In this way, 48 quotations served 100 words.

It is not easy to determine the reliability of Johnson's quotations, nor, perhaps, should we be critical of inaccuracies. He did not set out to provide

<sup>1</sup> See Boswell, *Journal of a Tour*, 14 October 1773, and *Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1905), ii. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the use he made of it for the plot of *Irene* [D. Nichol Smith, 'Johnson's *Irene*', *Essays and Studies*, vol. xiv (Oxford, 1929), and B. H. Bronson, *Johnson Agonistes and Other Essays* (Cambridge, 1946), refer], and his praise of Knolles, *Rambler*, 122.

<sup>3</sup> Approximate. I have identified this number of quotations from the *Remarks*, but the very large number of Addison extracts in the *Dictionary* probably includes more from this source.

<sup>4</sup> This figure is based on one count only and should also be taken as an approximation. For Johnson's relative use of these and other authors, cf. present writer's sample count of 10,724 quotations, *N. & Q.*, cxcv. 36-7.

<sup>5</sup> Since Johnson's own copy of this book has survived, the following additional notes may be of interest. The pages are marked in his usual manner—i.e. the beginning and end of quotations are indicated by pencil-strokes, the illustrated words briefly underlined, and their initial letters written in the margin. These initials were crossed out when the quotations had been copied. Johnson marked, altogether, some 964 passages from the iii+365 pages, of which number very nearly 500 were not, in the end, used. As might be expected, a noticeable proportion of the extracts illustrate words connected with logic and language. Many of these—e.g. *connexive, continuative, contraries, coordinate, copula, copulative, desitive, dichotomy, discriptive, homonymous, hypothetical, illative, predicables, predicate, premiss, propositional, prosyllogism, reduplicative, sub-contrary, subjective, synthetic, trichotomy*—stand in the *Dictionary* as the only illustration to their parent word. Sentences containing *telescope, microscope, and prismatick* were marked, but only the first was used. A number of words illustrated from the *Opticks* also carry with them quotations from Watts—*attribute, circle, colour, composition, concrete, corpuscle, green, intermediate, matter, notion, position, species, specifick, substance, and sweet*. It may be noted that Johnson also marked, but did not use, quotations for words for which he did use Newton extracts—e.g. *conformable, dilate, distinctly, dusky, light, mechanical, medium, nice, odd, precisely, rainbow, scope, superior, yellow*.

a dictionary of quotations so much as to explain the meaning and illustrate the correct usage of words. An adjusted quotation is not in itself a fault, and some of the divergences from Newton's text, illustrated below, look very much like printer's mistakes. With these reservations, it might be said that *Opticks* quotations suffer in about 140 instances by minor alterations of words or sentence-structure, by telescoping of phrases, &c. For example, Newton has (p. 102):

For *very long Tubes* are cumbersome, and scarce to be readily managed, and by *reason of their length* are very *apt to bend, and shake by bending, so as to cause a continual trembling in the Objects*, whereby it becomes difficult to see them distinctly: whereas by his *Contrivance the Glasses are readily manageable*. . . .

Johnson used only the italicized portion, as a quotation for *manageable*. Of the many examples of such omissions, two more may be given. Johnson quoted, under *aperture*:

The concave metal bore an aperture of an inch: but the aperture was limited by an opaque circle, perforated in the middle.

The original reads (p. 103):

The concave Metal bore an Aperture of an Inch and a third part: but the Aperture was limited not by an opake Circle, covering the Limb of the Metal round about, but by an opake Circle placed between the Eyeglass and the Eye, and perforated in the middle with a little round hole for the Rays to pass through to the Eye.

Under *artist*, Johnson quotes:

When I made this, an artist undertook to imitate it; but using another way, fell much short.

The original reads (p. 104):

When I made these an Artist in *London* undertook to imitate it; but using another way of polishing them than I did, he fell much short of what I had attained to. . . .

There are, in addition, 15 or so further instances of more serious omissions, misreadings, or alterations, sometimes affecting the sense of the passage. Under *electrick*, Johnson has 'to carry up lead, copper, or leaf-gold' for 'Leaf Copper, or Leaf Gold';<sup>1</sup> under *nourishment*, 'the central heat grows too feeble'<sup>2</sup> for 'the central Earth grows too feeble'; Newton's 'For if a thinn'd or plated Body, which being of an even thickness . . .'<sup>3</sup> appears under *plate* as 'If a thinned or plated body of an uneven thickness . . .', and under *slit* as 'If a tinned or plated body. . . .'<sup>4</sup> Johnson's *rubiform* and *rubrick*

<sup>1</sup> *Opticks*, p. 353.

<sup>2</sup> p. 387.

<sup>3</sup> p. 251.

<sup>4</sup> 'For if a thin'd or plated Body . . .' (*Opticks*, 1st edit.)

are 'rubriform'<sup>1</sup> and 'rubifick'<sup>2</sup> in Newton. Other appreciable variations from the original, representing something more than possible printer's errors, may be illustrated by the following pair of longer examples:

(i) Newton: 'Hence also it may be, that the Parts of Animals and Vegetables preserve their several Forms, and assimilate their Nourishment; the soft and moist Nourishment easily changing its Texture by a gentle Heat and Motion, till it becomes like the dense, hard, dry and durable Earth' (p. 387).

Johnson (under *assimilate*): 'Hence also animals and vegetables may assimilate their nourishment; moist<sup>3</sup> nourishment easily changing its texture, till it becomes like the dense earth.'

(ii) Newton: '... this Spirit being poured upon Iron, Copper, or Salt of Tartar, united with the Body and lets go the Water; doth not this shew that the acid Spirit is attracted by the Water, and more attracted by the fix'd Body than by the Water, and therefore lets go the Water to close with the fix'd Body?' (p. 381).

Johnson (under *close with*): 'This spirit, poured upon iron, unites with the body and<sup>4</sup> lets go the water; the acid spirit is more attracted by the fixed body, and lets go the water, to close with the fixed body.'

Johnson's 461 *Opticks* quotations represent (from the 406 pages of the 1931 reprint) 1·1 per page. In fact, he took no quotation at all from 200 pages (he seems, particularly, to have fought shy of those pages concerned with formulae, demonstrations, &c.—such would not, indeed, lend themselves to quotation). When he did quote, however, he tended to do so quite generously; many extracts are of the length of those illustrating, e.g., *divert* (80 words), *duplicate* (73), *ebullition* (77), *ether* (68), *fixity* (63), *froth* (80), *grain* (83), *lucid* (96), *marcasite* (92), *reciprocally* (88), *substance* (68), *white* (73). Where several quotations were taken from the same page, therefore, quite a deal of it was transferred to the *Dictionary* in one place or another. Page 16 may be taken as an example—italics show quoted material, capitals indicate words illustrated:

*make the Cornea and Coat of the crystalline Humour grow flatter than before, the Light will not be refracted enough, and for want of a sufficient Refraction will not converge to the bottom of the Eye but to some place beyond it, and by consequence paint in the bottom of the Eye a confused Picture, and according to the INDISTINCTNESS of this Picture the Object will appear confused. This is the reason of the decay of sight in old Men, and shews why their Sight is mended by SPEC-TACLES. For those Convex glasses supply the defect of PLUMPNESS in the Eye, and by increasing the Refraction make the Rays converge sooner, so as to convene distinctly at the bottom of the Eye if the Glass have a due degree of CON-*

<sup>1</sup> p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> 'most' (1773 edit.).

<sup>4</sup> 'unites . . . and' omitted in 1773 edit.

**VEXITY.** And the contrary happens in *short-sighted Men whose eyes are too plump*. For the Refraction being now too great, the Rays converge and CONVENE in the Eyes before they come at the bottom; and therefore the Pictures made in the bottom and the Vision caused thereby will not be distinct, unless the Object be brought so near the Eye as that the place where the converging Rays convene may be removed to the bottom, or that the plumpness of the Eye be taken off and the Refractions diminished by a Concave-glass of a due degree of Concavity, or lastly that by Age the Eye grow flatter till it come to a due Figure: For *SHORT-SIGHTED Men see remote Objects best in Old Age, and therefore they are accounted to have the most lasting Eyes.*

The number of quotations chosen from the end of the *Opticks* may suggest that Johnson read this part with particular interest. Book Three, Part I, begins with a number of Observations, after which Newton concludes by 'proposing only some Queries, in order to a farther search to be made by others'. From this point (p. 339) there is a sudden and noticeable jump in the passages selected for the *Dictionary*. These last 68 pages supplied Johnson with 173 quotations, an average of 2·5 per page, representing 37·5 per cent. of the total number of quotations. It is tempting to think that Newton's questions, leading as they do to speculations concerning the nature of the universe and to philosophical principles, would indeed attract Johnson's attention.<sup>1</sup>

## IV

Newton's *Opticks* followed upon much seventeenth-century speculation on the nature and behaviour of light, and the *Dictionary* shows us that

<sup>1</sup> By listing *Dictionary* quotations from a given author and tracking them down in the book concerned we are reversing Johnson's dictionary-making method. Such procedure leaves us with only those passages which he finally decided to use. It is conceivable that he might have marked a great many passages in pages which he read with considerable interest, and yet—if he eventually found himself unable to use them, or collected more appropriate examples—we would not know this unless we had his own marked copy. However, the marked copy of Watts's *Logick* shows that the density of used quotations is in proportion to the density of total passages marked, in this book, at any rate. Forty-six per cent. of the used quotations come from the first 100 pages; these pages contain a greater number of marked passages, used and unused: and whereas throughout the whole book Johnson used 49·5 per cent. of the marked passages, in the first 100 pages he used 60·8 per cent. The evidence of both used and unused marked passages does in fact suggest that he found this early portion to his taste.

Since comparison has already been made with Addison's *Remarks*, it might be added that a similar concentration of passages quoted is to be found towards the end of that book. Johnson took an average of 2·1 quotations per page from the *Remarks*, but the averages for the last three sections are 3·5 ('Geneva and the Lakes'), 3·1 ('Switzerland'), and 4 ('Tyrol'). That he only took an average of 2·5 words per page from the section describing 'The Republick of San Marino', which he called 'the most amusing passage' of the book in the *Life of Addison*, illustrates, however, the uncertainty which must attend such attempts to estimate reading-interest.

Johnson was well acquainted with it. Thus Bacon had adopted a subjective approach to the theory of colour. In *Sylva Sylvarum* he wrote:

The objects of the sight may cause a great pleasure and delight in the spirit, but no pain or great offence; except it be by memory, as hath been said. The glimpses and beams of diamonds that strike the eye; Indian feathers, that have glorious colours; the coming into a fair garden; the coming into a fair room richly furnished; a beautiful person; and the like; do delight and exhilarate the spirits much. . . . But the cause (chiefly) is that there be no active objects to offend the eye. For harmonical sounds are both active and positive: so are sweet smells and stinks: so are bitter and sweet in tastes: so are over-hot and over-cold in touch: but *blackness and darkness are indeed but privatives; and therefore have little or no activity*. *Somewhat they do contristate, but very little.*<sup>1</sup>

Johnson noted the passage, and used it to illustrate *contristate*. Browne's *Vulgar Errors* (1646) shows the same quality:

So Cinnabar becomes red by the acide exhalation of sulphur, which otherwise presents a pure and niveous white. So spirits of Salt upon a blew paper make an orient red. So Tartar or Vitriol upon an infusion of Violets affords a delightful Crimson. . . . Thus Salt-peter, Ammoniack, and Mineral spirits emit delectable and various colours; and common Aqua fortis will in some green and narrow mouthed glasses, about the verges thereof, send forth a deep and Gentianella blew . . . .<sup>2</sup>

a passage which Johnson quoted under *niveous*. Again, from Boyle's *Experiments and Considerations Touching Colours* (1664), he drew numerous passages to illustrate such words as *look*, *murrey*, *nitid*, *obscurity*, *obvert*, *plush*, *reflector*, *semidiaphaneity*, *speculum*, *strawy*, *torrefaction*, *translucency*, *vividly*, *undiaphonous*, *unobservable*, *unobvious*, *untransparent*—to take a selection from the second volume only of the *Dictionary*. Theories of vision had also exercised the minds of Browne and Boyle. The latter (in the above-quoted *Experiments . . . Touching Colours*) admitted a preference for the conception of colour-vision based on 'modified light':

. . . to take the more immediate cause of Colour to be the modifi'd Light it self, as it affects the Sensory; though the disposition also of the colour'd body, as that modifies the Light, may be call'd by that name Metonymically (to borrow a School term) or Efficiently, that is in regard of its turning the Light, that rebounds from it, or passes thorow it, into this or that particular Colour.<sup>3</sup>

We know that Johnson had read this passage, for he used the italicized passage to illustrate *metonymically*. Before Newton's time, too, the use of prisms was known to Bacon and Boyle. The latter again wrote (in *The Sceptical Chymist*, 1661):<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ed. Spedding (London, 1857), ii. 630.

<sup>2</sup> 5th edit., 1669, p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> 1911 reprint, p. 176. The *Dictionary* quotation ends at 'does' in 1773 edit.

I might here take notice of the pleasing variety of colours exhibited by the triangular glass (as 'tis wont to be called) and demand, what addition or decrement of either salt, sulphur, or mercury, befalls the body of the glass by being prismatically figured; and yet 'tis known, that without that shape it would not afford those colours as it does. But because it may be objected, that these are not real, but apparent colours. . . . I will alledge . . . a couple of examples,

a passage found in the *Dictionary* to illustrate prismatically.

Johnson's interest in the physico-theological books of Newton's time can be shown by his use of extracts in the *Dictionary*, many of them bearing on the subject of optics. Thus, from a dozen pages of Ray's *Wisdom of God manifested in the Creation* (1691),<sup>1</sup> he took quotations for *ciliary, crystalline humour, humour, lenticular, pupil, retiform, sclerotick, situate, tuncle, vitreous, unsoled, and uveous*; and from Bentley's *Eight Sermons* (1692)<sup>2</sup> he took the following passage:

[the eye] that . . . hath its many coats and humours transparent and colourless, lest it should tinge and sophisticate the light that it lets in, by a natural jaundice . . .

to illustrate *sophisticate*, and the following to illustrate *pound*:

For that very same opake and white powder of glass, when it is seen through a good microscope, doth exhibit all its little fragments pellucid and colourless; as the whole appeared to the naked eye, before it was pounded. . . .<sup>3</sup>

We may, therefore, claim that Johnson read closely for optical information in books which do in fact give a representative view of the subject for the period in question, yet Newton emerges as his primary authority. There are numerous references throughout the *Dictionary* which reinforce the evidence already given. Besides commenting on Newton's apparent misunderstanding of *coast* and *russet*, Johnson quoted long extracts from other sources bringing in mention of Newton, e.g. under *algebra*, *comet*, and *planet*; and short quotations often refer to Newtonian mathematics, astronomy, &c.—e.g. under *perihelium*, *quadrible*, *reflexible*, *ungeometrical*. He gave Thomson's lines on 'awful Newton' under *prism*; on 'Newton, pure intelligencer' under *simple*; and misquoted Pope's epitaph under *night*.<sup>4</sup> There is a particularly apt quotation from Cheyne under *optick*: 'Those who desire satisfaction must go to the admirable treatise of *opticks* by Sir Isaac Newton.'

Leaving the *Dictionary* for a moment, we find that Johnson praised Newton in the *Adventurer*, 131, and when he reviewed *Four Letters from Sir Isaac Newton to Dr. Bentley* in the *Literary Magazine*, 1756, he noted 'how even the mind of Newton gains ground gradually upon darkness'.

<sup>1</sup> (10th edit., 1735), Pt. II, pp. 248–60.

<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1809 edit. quoted), pp. 150–1.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., pp. 54–5.

<sup>4</sup> In 1773 edit.

Boswell quoted two references to Newton in the *Journal of a Tour* (ed. Chapman; Oxford, 1930, pp. 181 and 353), and Malone noted (Boswell, *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell; Oxford, 1934, ii. 125) that Johnson once 'remarked, that if Newton had flourished in ancient Greece, he would have been worshipped as a Divinity'.

C. S. Emden has referred to the large number of scientific similes, 'largely based on chemistry and optics',<sup>1</sup> to be found in Johnson's prose. A typical one is

... a nation scattered in the boundless regions of America resembles rays diverging from a focus. All the rays remain, but the heat is gone. Their power consisted in their concentration: when they are dispersed, they have no effect.<sup>2</sup>

Allusions to optical instruments and phenomena may be noticed here and there throughout Johnson's writings: they may not be evidence for more than his general interest in scientific matters. But I think there is a Newtonian ring about such a passage as this:

... the adventitious peculiarities of personal habits, are only superficial dies, bright and pleasing for a little while, yet soon fading to a dim tinct, without any remains of former lustre; but the discriminations of true passion are the *colours* of nature; they *pervade* the whole *mass*, and can only perish with the body that exhibits them. The accidental *compositions* of heterogeneous modes are *dissolved* by the chance which combined them; but the *uniform* simplicity of primitive qualities neither admits increase nor suffers *decay*.<sup>3</sup>

The italics are mine: and in the *Dictionary* Johnson had illustrated the words *colour*, *pervade*, *mass*, *composition*, *heterogeneous*, *dissolvable*, *uniformly*, and *decay*, all from the *Opticks*.<sup>4</sup>

## v

The writers mentioned in the first footnote to this article—especially Miss Marjorie Nicolson—have helped to draw our attention to the impact which Newton's exciting new theories about light and prisms and the colours of bubbles and rainbows made upon the poets, and to the fresh worlds opened to them (even before Newton) by the microscope and telescope. So far as Johnson is concerned, we can, with the help of the *Dictionary*, try to appreciate the extent of his interest in optics, and—by observing his choice of quotations—even follow him almost page by page through 'the admirable treatise' itself.

<sup>1</sup> 'Dr. Johnson and Imagery', *R.E.S.*, n.s. (1950), i. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Journey to the Western Islands*, ed. R. W. Chapman (Oxford, 1930), p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Sir W. Raleigh (Oxford, 1925), p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Between 1750 and 1754—i.e. immediately preceding first publication of the *Dictionary*—the number of images and references involving optical terms which occur in Johnson's writings is interesting. See *Rambler*, 23, 28, 83, 106, 112, 157, 176; *Adventurer*, 45, 95, 131, for examples.

## COLERIDGE ON CLASSICAL PROSODY: AN UNIDENTIFIED REVIEW OF 1797

By GEORGE WHALLEY

SOME time in 1828 Coleridge drafted a letter to the editor of the *Quarterly Review*, inquiring whether a couple of articles he had in mind 'would have a sufficient chance of finding admission into the Quarterly, to encourage me in writing it'. The draft has no address, date, conclusion, or signature. Whether a fair copy was ever sent we do not know: if it was, it was no more successful than his earlier and even more tentative attempts to follow in Southey's footsteps. But in the preamble he gives an account of his two brief excursions—in 1797 and 1808—into the 'immoral Act' of reviewing. Only the earlier part of the story concerns us here.

Soon after by occasion of a Scheme 'or Bladder' or Fancy bubble, to the bursting of which the World owes the *Thalaba*, *Curse of Kehama*, *Don Roderic*—in short, Robert Southey, I had quitted Cambridge, and from Opinions which less than two years sufficed for me to outgrow, I had given up all my then very flattering Prospects in the Church, and—married!—I was engaged, and if I recollect aright, thro' the mediation of Sir James, then M<sup>r</sup> James M<sup>c</sup>Intosh to write for the *Critical Review*—and I wrote an article on *Lewis's Monk*, and another on *Bishop Horsley's Tract on the Greek Metres*, which were perfected into Print. But I likewise had written some half a score or more of what, I thought, clever & epigrammatic & devilishly severe Reviews, from a single sentence to the quantum of half a page on sundry *Fungi* of the Press that had been sent to me, 'for' to abide the operation which united Trial, Verdict, and Execution—but a Remark made by Miss Wordsworth, to whom I had in full expectation of gaining a laugh of applause read one of my Judgements occasioned my committing the whole Batch to the Fire!—<sup>1</sup>

Coleridge did not in all details 'recollect aright'. He did not meet Mackintosh until after he had accepted the Wedgwood annuity at the turn of the year 1797–8—the annuity which was intended, among other things, to preserve him from the 'warping of the intellectual faculty' incidental to journalistic writing. It was to Daniel Stuart, owner and editor of the *Morning Post* and relative by marriage, that Mackintosh gave Coleridge an

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Add. MS. 34225, ff. 188–9v. Griggs printed the letter in *Unpublished Letters of Coleridge*, ii. 407, with slight verbal variation especially in the opening sentence. The letter dates itself by the reference to the first volume of W. F. P. Napier's *History of the War in the Peninsula*, &c. (6 vols., 1828–40). The 1808 review mentioned in this letter was of Thomas Clarkson's *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, &c. (2 vols., 1808), published in the *Edinburgh Review* of July 1808. [Words in half brackets deleted in MS.]

introduction; that was in 1798, and Coleridge neglected to call on Stuart on his way to Germany in September. But the rest of the 1828 statement is accurate enough. He did review Lewis's *The Monk* in the *Critical Review*. He might well forget or not take into account three other reviews of Gothic romances in the same periodical: one in 1794 which consists almost entirely of quotation, and two in 1798 both of which are short and unimportant.<sup>1</sup> The review of *The Monk*, embodying the first sketch for his doctrine of Dramatic Illusion and giving the first public evidence of an acute critical power, was worth remembering. And in the same (February 1797) issue of the *Critical Review* that carried that article there appeared the other article that Coleridge remembered—a long notice of an anonymous essay *On the Prosodies of the Greek and Latin Languages* (1796).

A month after these reviews had appeared Coleridge told Bowles that he had been 'an hireling in the *Critical Review* for these last six or eight months' and that he had 'been lately reviewing the *Monk*, the *Italian*, Hubert de Sevrac, etc., etc.'<sup>2</sup> On the occasion of a favourable review of *Poems on Various Subjects*, in the previous July Lamb had inquired with pleasant malice: 'Are you not connected with the *Critical Review*?—but Coleridge's answer is not preserved. In any case it is clear that the 1794 review of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* was an isolated contribution before he was regularly engaged. And when he told Poole in December that 'I receive about forty guineas yearly from the "Critical Review" and the new "Monthly Magazine"' he was indulging in a forecast of prospects rather than giving a statement of income received.<sup>3</sup> The letter to Bowles would place his engagement with the *Critical Review* in September or October 1796; and the *Monthly Magazine* published poems of his in both those months. Whether or not he wrote at the same time small hitherto unrecognized reviews for the *Critical* is matter for conjecture. But on 25 October 1796 he borrowed from the Bristol Library Society a copy of John Foster's *Essay on . . . Accent and Quantity* (1763) and returned it on 9 November.<sup>4</sup> This borrowing marks the date that he set to work on his first big assignment for the *Critical Review*, the article on Samuel Horsley's anonymous pamphlet on classical prosody.

Although the borrowing of Foster suggests that he started with vigorous intentions, he did not complete the review at once: indeed, by 8 December

<sup>1</sup> All four were identified by Garland Greever and reprinted in his *A Wiltshire Parson and his Friends* (Boston, 1926). They are: (a) Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794), August 1794; (b) M. G. Lewis's *The Monk* (1796), February 1797; (c) Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian* (1797), June 1798; (d) Mary Robinson's *Hubert de Sevrac* (1796), August 1798.

<sup>2</sup> Greever, *op. cit.*, p. 30; March 1797.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters of Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (1895), i. 185. But see *R.E.S.* xv. (1939), 45ff.

<sup>4</sup> G. Whalley, 'The Bristol Library Borrowings of Southey and Coleridge, 1793-8', *The Library*, iv (1949), 114-32; see Entries 88 and 92.

he had lost the review copy and sent the following instructions to John Colson in Bristol:

... the moment you receive this letter, if possible, . . . buy for me a pamphlet entitled 'an Essay on the Prosodies of the Greek & Latin Language'—dedicated to Lord Thurlow. It is a three shilling touch, I believe. I had to review & have lost it—and it is of the *utmost* consequence to me to have it *directly*.<sup>1</sup>

Colson seems to have acted promptly, for Coleridge again borrowed Foster from the Bristol Library on 13 December. It is only fair to say that during the last weeks in Bristol he was seriously agitated by financial anxiety and the fluctuating plans for his move to Nether Stowey. He must have taken Foster's *Essay* to Stowey with him when he moved at the end of the year, and did not return it until 9 March 1797 after the librarian had requested its return; and the chances are that the review of Horsley's pamphlet was completed, if not entirely written, in Stowey and not in Bristol. So, after some three months, this article was printed in February 1797. One supposes that its companion piece on *The Monk* was a less leisurely performance.<sup>2</sup>

The Horsley review gives a vivid glimpse of Coleridge at twenty-four, when he had suffered his first bitter political and personal disillusionment, when he was working on *Osorio* and preparing a second edition of his poems in the hope that although he was 'not fit for public life, yet the light shall stream to a far distance from my cottage window'. He comes suddenly to life in the judicious tone of self-assurance, in the declamatory italics, the rhetorical questions, and the two footnotes—one punitive and the other learned though borrowed. The reference to Lord Thurlow at the end is ambiguous; but he could not resist a mild pun at the expense of the bishop whose controversy with Priestley was matter of personal concern to himself. In this article he shows that he has mastered the reviewer's trick of making the most impressive use of materials conveniently at hand.

<sup>1</sup> MS. letter in the Houghton Library, Harvard.

<sup>2</sup> *Critical Review*, xix. 139–44, 194–200 (*The Monk*). On 16 March 1797 Coleridge told Josiah Wade that 'my review business had been suffered to accumulate so as to excite great discontent in my employers; for this last three weeks I have been compelled to devote great part of my time to it' (*Unpublished Letters*, i. 72). Although he evidently read *The Italian* and *Hubert de Sevrac* early in 1797, his reviews did not appear until June and August 1798. The new friendship with the Wordsworths was reason enough to procrastinate. The Wordsworths came to Stowey on 2 July on their way to Alfoxden; but the Dorothy incident (not recorded except in the 1828 draft letter) may have occurred as early as June 1797 when Coleridge visited them at Racedown, read aloud his uncompleted *Osorio* and heard William read *The Borderers* and some poems. There is no reason to doubt Coleridge's memory of the incident. It would account for the interruption of more than a year in his contributions to the *Critical Review*. And one supposes that after long silence the editors demanded something in return at least for their review copies; but they received less than three pages on *The Italian* and about a dozen lines on *Hubert de Sevrac*. One wonders whether these, like George Dyer's cancelled 1800 Preface to his *Poems*, were 'snatch'd out of the fire'.

But the review throws a more favourable light on Coleridge. He was able to find and make full use of an appropriately weighty authority—in this case Foster—to which he extends a critical interest as lively as he devotes to the text under review. Also he contributes a couple of arguments of his own (p. 245, ll. 35-41, and p. 246, ll. 26 ff.), which owe their force to their good sense and his ability to make connexions between the recondite and the real. And his final quotation from Foster is an early assertion of the critical principle stated in *Biographia Literaria* and elsewhere: 'It is a maxim with me, always to suppose myself ignorant of a writer's understanding, until I understand his ignorance.' But those who rejoice in the inconsistencies of genius will be pleased to notice that, despite his Christ's Hospital training and his unquestionable mastery of Greek, he usually avoided (except when transcribing from a text) the intricacies of Alexandrine pedantry by omitting all accents from his Greek, and was wilfully inaccurate in his use of breathings. The divergencies from Horsley in pointing the Greek in this review are characteristically Esteesean and need not be attributed to careless type-setting.

It is surprising perhaps that Coleridge should have 'given so long an account' of an unimportant anonymous pamphlet.<sup>1</sup> The reason might be youthful punctiliousness in a task freshly undertaken or the acknowledged desire to be 'clever & epigrammatic & devilishly severe'; but more probably it reflects his increasing preoccupation with the minutiae of prosody. The evidence for his keen technical interest, as time went on, becomes voluminous. And his daughter Sara, who could only speak from what Southey and Wordsworth had told her and from the Highgate years, told a friend in 1844 that her father, 'whose versification has been greatly admired by critics, was fond of talking about anapæsts and iambuses; and if people admired "Christabel", as it were, by nature, he was never easy till he had put them in the way of admiring it more scientifically'.<sup>2</sup> Within a year of writing this review, Coleridge had made a number of poems which exhibit a flawless sense of the values and sounds of words dynamically modulated in the context of verse. This was achieved, as Wordsworth was not reluctant to record, not by instinctive *flair* so much as by painstaking labour and ruthless self-criticism.

<sup>1</sup> In 1797 Dr. Warner published anonymously a pamphlet entitled *Metronariston: or a new pleasure recommended, in a dissertation upon a part of greek and latin prosody*. The introduction is dated 24 February 1797, and in a postscript (pp. 113-20) the author writes: 'Just as the preceding Dissertation was going to the press, a friend put into my hand an Essay which I had not seen before, "On the Prosodies of the Greek and Latin Language." I opened it eagerly . . . but was greatly disappointed . . . that . . . "the design of this Essay was to explain in what manner pronunciation is to be governed by Accents;" which . . . has nothing in common with . . . pronunciation . . . governed by Quantity.' I am not informed what had aroused this sudden interest in Greek prosody and pronunciation.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoir and Letters of Sara Coleridge*, ed. Edith Coleridge (London, 1873), i. 307-8.

The most noticeable marks of Gothic romance in the first version of *The Ancient Mariner* are to be seen in the excesses of horror, overstatement, and archaic diction which Coleridge refined away in later revision. The great debt he owed to M. G. Lewis, however, was not for these external mechanisms, but for the 'specific overpowering tune' of a ballad appended to *The Monk* and for a 'pretty little ballad-song' introduced into *The Castle Spectre* — a poem peculiar for an 'innocent nakedness' which Coleridge himself despaired of attaining.<sup>1</sup> Gothic romance was important to his *annus mirabilis* because of such marginal acquisitions and the critical thought they aroused in him. Bishop Horsley's pamphlet gave Coleridge nothing directly; but by a fruitful coincidence it brought him in touch with Foster's *Essay*, and by setting him to think more specifically upon matters of prosody probably helped to crystallize his earlier more diffuse notions of English prosody at the time when he was coming to full poetic stature.

*Critical Review, XIX. 139-44 (February 1797)*

*On the Prosodies of the Greek and Latin Languages. 8vo. 4s. Sewed. Robson. 1796.*

This is a very learned essay, with the least possible ostentation of learning. The first four pages, in a clear and satisfactory manner, comprise the substance of Foster's two first chapters, namely, the difference between accent and quantity, and the argument that accent does not give quantity in other languages, although it almost always does in the English.<sup>2</sup> The author proceeds to state the signification of the three accentual marks; the general laws of accentuation among the Greeks; and in what respects these differ from the Latin rules; he then points out the superiority of the Greek over the Latin system, and concludes with insisting on the advantages of reading the Greek language by its own accents. Inclusively he endeavours to prove, first, that the present marks are faithful notations of the ancient tones,—and secondly, that the marks themselves are of very high antiquity. On all these points his remarks are ingenious, and for the greater part original; and, with the exception of the last hypothesis, solid and convincing. Respecting the signification of the three accentual marks, he supposes the acute to be in truth the only accent or tone, the grave being merely a negation of acuteness, and the circumflex nothing more than a compound of the marks of the acute accent (') with the marks of a long quantity (").

'It was probably originally expressed by the two strait lines joined together thus \_; and this stiff mark was changed into the curve ~, partly for the

<sup>1</sup> *Biographia Literaria*, ed. Shawcross, ii. 24; *Letters*, i. 237.

<sup>2</sup> John Foster (1731-74). *An essay On the Different Nature of Accent and Quantity With their Use and Application in the English, Latin, and Greek Languages: Containing Remarks on the Metre of the English; on the origin and Ælism of the Roman; on the general History of the Greek, with an account of its Ancient Tones, and a defence of their present Accentual Marks. . . . The second edition, Corrected and much enlarged. . . . With a Reply to Dr. G[ally]'s Second Dissertation in Answer to the Essay, &c. Eton, 1763.*

convenience of writing expeditiously, and partly, perhaps, for the greater elegance of the shape. Long syllables only could bear a circumflex; and this compound mark expressed, that the syllable was to be pronounced both with a sharp stroke, and a lengthened sound. It was of great importance, that this circumstance should be suggested to the reader's attention by a distinct mark; because the natural tendency of the acute accent, contrary to the prejudice of the English ear, is to shorten the time of the syllable on which it falls;<sup>1</sup> especially of the last syllable of a word, and of the penult, the two seats of the circumflex. The reader, therefore, was to be put upon his guard, when the acute tone fell upon either of these syllables being long, not to suffer any acceleration of his voice, a natural, but by no means a necessary effect of the acute accent, to take place in violation of quantity.' P. 9.

The superiority of the Greek to the Latin system of accentuation in reading the Greek language is, thus stated—

'The two opposite rules for the accentuation of words of more than two syllables, the Greek rule requiring an acute upon the penultima, whatever might be its own quantity, when the final syllable was long; and the Latin rule forbidding the penult to be acute, when itself was short; seem to have been both in some degree arbitrary; since neither was positively inconsistent with quantity. The rule of the Greek language, however, was much the best considered of the two; as it was the best calculated for the preservation of the true rhythm, with ease to the speaker. This will appear by trying the effect of both systems in Greek verse. . . .

... 'Οὐλομένην, ἡ μωρ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἀλγε' ἔθηκε.'<sup>2</sup>

'He who, with the Latins, shall say οὐλόμενην, though he will preserve the brevity of the two syllables -λο- and -μεν-, will find it difficult not to shorten the two long syllables ου- and -μεν; especially the former. But he who, adhering to the rule of the Greeks, shall say, οὐλομένην, will find that without any effort, and almost in spite of himself, he will give the syllables ου- and ην- in their just length. The same thing might be shewn in innumerable instances.' P. 19.

We indeed of this country read the Greek and Latin as we read the English, which differs in the powers of the vowels from every other language upon earth.<sup>3</sup> Our author well describes the metrical havoc which this occasions. 'Long is made short, and short is made long; dactyls and anapæsts are confounded; and the former in heroic verse often turned into amphibrachs, cretics, bachii, and antibacchii.' To reform this barbarous mode of reading, and to teach the way of giving accent, so as to be not destructive of quantity, but subservient to it, he considers two things only as requisite—'first, to give every one of the vowels, and of the diphthongs, its true power, in its proper place; and, secondly, to pay a

<sup>1</sup> Coleridge's italics. Unless otherwise indicated italics in the quotations are carried over from the original from which Coleridge is quoting.

<sup>2</sup> Horsley writes: Οὐλομένην, ἡ μωρ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἀλγε' ἔθηκε. In transcribing the Greek, digraphs have been expanded and obsolete letters modernized. The marks of elision at this point appear in the *Critical Review* article.

<sup>3</sup> This sentence paraphrases Horsley's original.

critical attention to the effect of the fundamental rules of accent upon the *tones of words in connection*, a point which, perhaps, has never been sufficiently considered.' He describes at length the powers of the several vowels and diphthongs, and points out the usual errors of our pronunciation, and then enumerates ten changes, which he conceives the *tone of connected words* to have undergone. These changes formed the laws of modulation. 'Accent marked the tone of the solitary word. Modulation was the effect of accent upon words in connection.'

Dr. Henry Gally, in his dissertation against pronouncing the Greek language according to accents (published anonymously), observes, that 'nothing would show the absurdity of the modern system of accents more effectually, than to take a piece of poetry, and place the accents according to the quantity which the doubtful and long vowels and diphthongs have in their respective places. This would cause such a variation in the place of the accents, arising from the different length or shortness of the vowels and diphthongs in their different situations, as would make the modern system of accents quite ridiculous.'<sup>1</sup>

Our author thinks \*so differently, that he has actually printed forty lines of Homer, with the accentual marks changed and transposed according to the changes which the quantities of the doubtful and long vowels and diphthongs have suffered from the laws of position; and we certainly are prepared to give our suffrage to the *probability* of his system. The accurate recitation of poetry was held in high esteem among the ancients, and seems to have been studied as an art. Now its difficulty could hardly have consisted in the mere chanting; whereas to watch the changes in the quantities of the final syllables, and transpose the accentual tone according to those changes without error or hesitation, would indeed require much attention and long practice. If the system should pass unhurt through the ordeal of sound criticism, to read regularly a few lines of some Greek poet according to it, would form, we should conceive, an amusing and useful exercise for the higher classes in our great schools. The young men would at least acquire by it the habit of distinct pronunciation, so important in public speaking, but which so few of our public speakers possess.

\* Dr. Gally's treatise is not once mentioned by our author, nor Foster's celebrated Reply to it. His silence respecting the latter admirable work seems strange. Rev.<sup>2</sup>

† It was a part of a learned education among the ancients—Idem *Thrax sex fecit partes grammaticae; exercitatum in accentu lectionem; expositionem, &c.* Sext. c. 16.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Henry Gally (1696–1769). Gally published two anonymous dissertations on accent: (a) *A dissertation against pronouncing the Greek Language according to accents* (1754); (b) *A second Dissertation against pronouncing the Greek Language according to accents, in answer to Mr. Foster's Essay, &c.* (1763). Foster replied to the *Second Dissertation* in the second (1763) edition of his *Essay*, devoting to it a 49-page appendix, separately paginated, with the half-title: *A review Of some passages in the preceding essay, in reply to Dr. G.'s Second Dissertation.* Foster refers throughout to 'Dr. G.' Gally's two *Dissertations* and Foster's answers were reprinted in the third edition of the *Essay* (1820).

<sup>2</sup> Coleridge here draws upon Foster and not directly upon Gally. It is interesting, therefore, to notice that he does not once mention the work so inescapably prominent in Horsley's appendix: William Primatt, *Accentus Redivivi: or, a defence of an accented pronunciation of Greek prose; . . . together with an answer to the objections of Mekerhus, I. Vossius, Hennius, and other modern opposers of Greek accents* (Cambridge, 1764).

<sup>3</sup> Cited by Foster, *Essay*, p. 161.

We shall now proceed to consider our author's argument in favour of the antiquity of the present accentual marks. Whether these marks (supposing their antiquity to be incapable of proof) do yet 'exhibit the true speaking tones of the language, such as were used by the Greeks themselves, when it was a living language, and spoken in its purity'—this question is stated, but not answered. Indeed Foster seems to us to have proved the affirmative unanswerably, although that the words ending in *α* or *ο* are marked on the antepenult in the present system of accentuation, appears to us a suspicious circumstance, and to savour of the 'vile Iotacism', which began to prevail about the times of Adrian and Antoninus. The present essayist has chosen a ground hitherto unoccupied, and indeed given up by the judicious Foster as untenable. He endeavours to prove that these marks were *in common use in writing* from a very early age, before Plato or Aristotle, if indeed the invention of them were not coëval with the first writing of the language. To prove this, he begins by stating the objection, 'that the marks of the Greek accents are not to be found in monumental inscriptions, in the legends upon coins, nor *in many* of the oldest manuscripts.' Now the assertion from Montfaucon is, that there exist *no* manuscripts with the accentual marks, older than the seventh century. If this be true, it seems a difficulty not to be removed; but Wetstein, in the quotation annexed to this essay, asserts that the marks are found in manuscripts older than the *sixth* century. Montfaucon, if we recollect aright, mentions the particular manuscript which he deemed the most ancient of the accented manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> This circumstance should have been noticed, and his mistake, if it be a mistake, detected. The essayist proceeds to authorities: and the first which he adduces is that of Quintilian. 'First, then, it is certain the *marks* of accent were in use in the time of Quintilian. For we find all the three, the acute, the grave, and the circumflex, mentioned by Quintilian.' But *how* mentioned? As written? or only as to be sounded? Of the latter the proofs are abundantly clear; but we cannot find a single sentence which could lead us to a conjecture in favour of the former. But he goes higher. 'The marks of accents were in common use in writing in the time of Strabo.' We have examined the mutilated passage alluded to; and find, as in the former instance, a convincing proof that words were *sounded* with accents,—and of nothing else. The geographer says, that the Iliensians, by a transposition of the accent, rendered *ἐνι γονάσιν*, 'for supplications,' instead of 'upon the knees,' in a particular line of Homer; contending that it ought to be *ἐνι γονάσιν*. An old English dictionary now before us, having classed together (in the preface) a number of disyllable substantives and adjectives, as *absent, abstract, contract, &c. &c.* adds, 'by the transposition of the accent, these become verbs.' Would it be a legitimate inference from this passage, that accentual marks were in common use *in writing* in the time of this lexicographer? And what greater force does the *διαστρέφειν τας προσῳδίας* of Strabo possess?—With the same inconclusiveness of argument, our essayist reasons in his authorities from Plato and Aristotle. The passages, to which he alludes, prove indisputably the use of accentual *tones*, and make it probable that our accentual *marks* faithfully represent them; but they prove nothing more.

<sup>1</sup> For Foster on Montfaucon, see *Essay*, pp. 187–8 and note; p. 200 and note; &c.

'Aristotle, in his Poetics, speaks of acuteness, gravity, and that which is betwixt the two; and, in his Rhetoric, mentions the three accents, the acute, the grave, and the middle.' These expressions have references entirely to *sound*, and in no respect to *figure*. What Aristotle calls the middle, Dionysius Thrax, a grammarian in the time of Pompey the Great, calls *περισπαμένος*; and from this word, as descriptive of the figure of the *written* circumflex, it has been inferred that the marks must then have existed. If this argument prove its existence in the time of Dionysius Thrax, it certainly militates against its existence in the time of Aristotle. But in truth the word is *not* descriptive of the circumflex mark, as it is exhibited in the oldest accented manuscript. Magliabechi informed Wetstein, that in all the most ancient MSS. the circumflex bore the form of an inverted v. 'Circumflexus <sup>^</sup> v inversi formam ubique refert.'<sup>1</sup> We would render *περισπαμένος*, by 'drawn out in rounded tones,' in which sense it would indicate the *sound* only of the accent, in the same manner as its two companions, the grave and the acute. His next argument is, if possible, still more weak. It was an Athenian law, 'Ἐγάρα χρνοίς εἰ φοροῖ δημόσια ἔστω,'<sup>2</sup> i.e. If a courtesan wear golden trinkets, let *them* be forfeited to the public. But if the word *δημόσια* were accented on the penult instead of the antepenult, the sense would be, 'If the courtesan wear golden trinkets, let *her* become public property.'<sup>3</sup> Our essayist adds, 'This is a very notable instance of the political importance of accents, of *written* accents, in the Greek language.'<sup>4</sup> For if this law had been put in writing, without any accent upon the word *δημόσια*, there would have been no means of deciding between two constructions, either of which the words, in this state, would have equally admitted;<sup>5</sup> and it must have rendered an inexplicable doubt, whether the legislator meant that the poor woman should only forfeit her trinkets, or become a public slave.' Much *pathos* is here displayed; and we sincerely sympathise with the puzzled judges and the trembling courtesan. But unfortunately we have a parallel case in *our own* country, which takes away all appearance of plausibility from this notable instance. The English statutes are never punctuated; neither are wills: and no man can have attended a court of justice without having witnessed the disputes, and sometimes the important disputes, which this practice occasions. Without doubt, the legislators foresaw this; but they saw likewise, that more disputes and greater ambiguities would arise from a contrary practice. Would the doubtful meaning of an unpointed sentence in the law of Moses prove the antiquity of the Masoretic points?<sup>6</sup>

We shall only add, that if our essayist had succeeded in proving the antiquity of the accentual marks, he would have completely overthrown his own ingenious scheme of modulation in poetry. As the marks must have been added (except on doubtful words) solely as assistants to right pronunciation, it is not credible that they should have been placed in poetry, so as not to give no assistance [*sic*], but

<sup>1</sup> Foster mentions a Medicean manuscript communicated by Magliabechi (so Foster spells the name) to Wetstein, *Essay*, p. 179, note, and Appendix, p. 33, note. Foster's Introduction observes that Wetstein got 'in difficulties by confusing Accent and metre'. Horsley prints in his appendix fragments of Thrax published by Wetstein.

<sup>2</sup> Horsley writes: '... φοροῖς'.

<sup>3</sup> 'Courtesan' following Horsley.

<sup>4</sup> Coleridge's italics.

<sup>5</sup> Horsley writes: '... would equally have admitted'.

<sup>6</sup> Coleridge had learned some Hebrew at Christ's Hospital under James Boyer.

to bewilder and mislead. This phænomenon can be explained by the lateness of the invention only.—On the whole, therefore, we cannot but be of opinion that the essayist should have acquiesced in the following sensible remark of his ingenious predecessor. 'Many diligent persons have with learning and industry laboured to prove, from passages of ancient authors, and other strong testimonies, that these marks of accentuation were not known to the old Greeks. And they have, I think, proved it satisfactorily: which yet perhaps they might have done as clearly by a shorter way, I mean by this plain argument, that such helps and directions in the pronunciation of a language of any country, are not requisite in writings, drawn up in the vernacular tongue of the nation for the use of its natives, who must be supposed not to want instruction in that respect.' Foster on Accent and Quantity, p. 178.

The learned and ingenious essay, of which we have given so full an account, is dedicated to lord Thurlow,<sup>1</sup> and has been attributed to a dignitary of the church.<sup>2</sup> It certainly possesses that manliness of style, which distinguishes the more important writings of the champion of orthodoxy. If it has been rightly *fathered*, it is an amusing coincidence, that old bishop Gardiner (the vigorous defender of the then established church) published an essay on a similar subject.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In 1787 Edward Thurlow (1731-1806) exercised his privilege to secure preferment for Samuel Horsley (see note 2 below). Coleridge may refer to this fact as a means of tacitly identifying the author of this pamphlet. The identity of the author was evidently a very open secret. At least one other reviewer, possibly Coleridge's friend Wrangham, speaks of the pamphlet as 'the reputed work of a prelate' and credits him with 'real genius and learning' [British Critic, viii (1796), 521-7]. He also notices in a footnote that 'Foster is not mentioned. Primiti only in an appendix.' There are no signs that Coleridge borrowed from this review.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Horsley (1733-1806), Bishop of St. Asaph, Fellow of the Royal Society (1767-84), editor of Newton (1785). From 1788 onwards he had conducted a controversy against Priestley and the views finally embodied in Priestley's *Corruptions of Christianity* (1782). Until 1799 Coleridge was an enthusiastic adherent to Priestley's necessitarian and unitarian doctrines, had borrowed Priestley's *Corruptions* from the Bristol Library Society in March 1795, and was familiar with his other work both theological and scientific. In the *Gutch Memorandum Book* Coleridge noted down the titles of Horsley's *Sermons* and his edition of Newton, but I find no conclusive evidence that he read either before leaving for Germany in September 1798. Coleridge's jibe at Horsley is not then simply a random shot at 'orthodoxy'.

<sup>3</sup> Stephen Gardiner (1483?-1555), Bishop of Winchester. Foster writes in his Introduction: 'The dispute between Mr. Cheke, the famous Greek professor of Cambridge, and his opponents, about the middle of the sixteenth century, turned upon examining and determining the sound of the Greek letters taken singly; not on the sound of syllables, considered relatively to each other in their combined modulation, which is the subject before us at present, and very distinct therefore from that which was then discussed with so much spirit, genius, and learning, by Bishop Gardiner and Mr. Cheke. Accents had no share in this dispute. That labourious and ingenious reformer of the Greek pronunciation [Cheke] left the marks as he found them, looking on them as the genuine signs of the ancient tones, and as authentic remains of antiquity.' Coleridge evidently did not inquire further and was misled by Foster's waiver of discussion. Gardiner did not—as far as the bibliographies show—publish an 'essay'; and if he had it would have been concerned—as Foster says—with pronunciation and not with accent. For controversy between Gardiner and Sir John Cheke (1514-57), see D.N.B. Seven letters that passed between them on this occasion were published in Basle in 1555.

## POSSIBLE INDEBTEDNESS OF KEATS'S 'ISABELLA' TO THE *DECAMERON*

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

**I**N a previous article<sup>1</sup> I examined the relationship of Keats's 'Isabella' to Boccaccio's tale, as the poet read it in the fifth edition of the anonymous English version of 1620. Since that article was written, the possibility of a still greater indebtedness has suggested itself.

One feature of the tale that deserves closer study than it has hitherto received is the description of the scene of Lorenzo's murder. The story in the original Italian has little to say about it, for Boccaccio was above all concerned with swift narration. The event, not the place, was for him the main thing. Evidently the crime was committed somewhere near Messina, the town where Lorenzo had fallen in love with Lisabetta, but the route taken by Lorenzo and her brothers is extremely vague. They went outside the city, and in 'a very solitary and remote place' Lorenzo was slain and buried. When his ghost appears to Lisabetta, it makes no precise statement about the spot where the body lies, but merely indicates 'where they had interred him'. Lisabetta obtains permission to go 'a little way out of the city',<sup>2</sup> and when she and her attendant arrive at the scene of the murder, all we learn is that she cleared away the leaves and dug where the ground seemed less hard. On the whole, the version of 1620 follows all this faithfully enough, except that the translator, who is very partial to alliteration, introduces a slight modification for the sake of this literary device:

Having obtained favour of her Brethren, to ride a *days* journey from the City, . . . they rode directly to the designed place, which being covered with some store of dried leaves, and more deeply sunk than any other part of the Ground thereabout, they *digged* not far, but they found the body of the murthered Lorenzo.<sup>3</sup> Even with this change the only impression that Keats could glean from the tale itself was that the murder occurred in a hollow in a lonely wood at no great distance from Messina.

The poem, on the other hand, transfers the scene to the vicinity of Florence. It may be argued that this alteration was due to general considerations such as the long-standing reputation of Florence in art, politics,

<sup>1</sup> *T. L. S.*, 17 April 1943.

<sup>2</sup> 'alquanto fuor della terra.'

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 'E avuta la licenzia d'andare alquanto fuor della terra . . . quanto più tosto potè, là se n'andò. E tolte via foglie secche che nel luogo erano, dove men dura le parve la terra, quivi cavò. Nè ebbe guari cavato, che ella trovò il corpo del suo misero amante.' It will be seen that 'alquanto fuor della terra' has been inaccurately rendered by 'a *days* journey' and 'dove men dura le parve la terra' by 'more deeply sunk than any other part of the Ground thereabout' for the sake of the alliteration in 'd'.

and literature, but such a contention is too nebulous to carry much weight. At first glance it might appear more likely that Dante's occasional references to the Arno in the *Divine Comedy* played some part. However, these bear little relation to the poem,<sup>1</sup> and as for Cary's footnote about the source of the river,<sup>2</sup> which might be held to have prompted the ride 'towards the Apennine',<sup>3</sup> it was added in the 1819 edition of his translation, after 'Isabella' was completed. Evidently, therefore, the *Divine Comedy* provides no solution.

An explanation must be sought elsewhere, but before this is attempted, it should be noted that the sole desire of Isabella's brothers when inviting Lorenzo to ride with them is to lure him to the most convenient spot for the murder. They tell him that they will 'spur three leagues', that is, some nine miles from Florence, but we do not hear how far they actually went. This is not surprising, as Keats's task was to create poetic atmosphere, not to record distances like a guide-book. Nevertheless, it would seem that he imagined the crime as occurring at a lonely place easily reached on horseback from the city.

In considering what he had in mind, we cannot afford to overlook the variant 'Boccace of green Arno' (l. 145) which by associating the two names suggests that it was perhaps Boccaccio who inspired the removal of the tale from Messina to Florence. In that case, we are led to ask whether some hints may not be derived from parts of the *Decameron* outside the story. While it is true that Boccaccio avoids description in order to concentrate attention on the fortunes of the two lovers, he does tell us elsewhere something of the neighbourhood of Florence. In the Induction he relates how the narrators, leaving the city behind them, arrived at their destination, 'which was seated on a little Hill, distant (on all sides) from any High-way, plentifully stored with fair spreading Trees', and this isolated dwelling chosen because it decreased the risk of infection by the plague, was 'due piccole miglia' or, as the version of 1620 says, 'about a Leagues distance' from Florence. In the links that unite the ten days of the *Decameron* and provide an artistic relief from each series of tales, Boccaccio is glad to linger a while in the pleasant garden of the palace where the narrators are assembled or amid its sylvan surroundings.

In one such passage at the end of the sixth day he depicts at length the Valle delle Donne. Here

was a small running Brook, descending from one of the Valleys, that divided two of the little Hills, and fell directly through a Vein of the intire Rock it self, that

<sup>1</sup> See, however, later for a possible slight influence combining with that of Boccaccio.

<sup>2</sup> 'The Arno, that rises in Falterona, a mountain in the Apennine. Its course is a hundred and twenty miles . . .' (cf. *Purgatory*, xiv. 17-21 in Cary's version).

<sup>3</sup> 'Isabella', l. 186.

the fall and murmur thereof was most delightful to hear, . . . and arriving in the Plain beneath, it was there received into a small Channel, swiftly running through the midst of the Plain, to a place where it stayed, and shaped it self into a Lake or Pond, . . . This Pond was no deeper, than to reach the breast of a man, and having no mud or soil in it, the bottom thereof shewed like small beaten gravel, . . . And not only was the bottom thus apparently seen, but also such plenty of Fishes swimming every way, as the mind was never to be wearied in looking on them. Nor was this water bounded in with any banks, but only the sides of the Meadow, which made it appear more sightly as it arose in swelling plenty. And always as it superabounded in this course, lest it should overflow disorderly: it fell into another Channel, which conveying it along the lower Valley, ran forth to water other needful places.

Apart from the reference to the pool with its fish darting about, the most striking feature is the picture of a stream liable to grow turbulent in flood, but making its way through narrow channels which prevent the inundation of the surrounding plain.

In 'Isabella' the journey is in the reverse direction. Attended by Lorenzo, the brothers first ride to the Arno. What information Keats had about the river we do not know. But it is conceivable that Cary's somewhat inaccurate translation of Dante's 'fiumicel' by 'brooklet'<sup>1</sup> induced him to believe that the Arno was much smaller than in reality. It would therefore be easy for Keats to identify the river with the brook that issued from the Valle delle Donne. Bearing this possibility in mind, we can follow the course of the riders to

where Arno's stream  
Gurgles through straiten'd banks, and still doth fan  
Itself with dancing bulrush, and the bream  
Keeps head against the freshets.

(st. xxvii)

This makes us wonder whether the 'straiten'd banks' were not suggested by the lower channel of Boccaccio in the above description and the 'freshets' by the mention of the 'swelling plenty' of the brook. The 'bream', which perhaps is introduced for the sake of the rhyme, is not without a counterpart in Boccaccio's narrative, though he is content not to define the species of fish visible to the characters of the *Decameron*.

Mounting still higher up the Arno, Lorenzo and the brothers 'pass'd the water' and entered a lonely forest. This is precisely what we should expect, for the Valle delle Donne, to which the ladies among the narrators withdraw in order to bathe, is appropriately secluded. Hills surround it, 'covered with small Thickets, or Woods of Oaks, Ashes, and other Trees', and in the valley is a copse

<sup>1</sup> *Purgatory*, xiv. 18. This was accessible to Keats, as the whole of the *Divine Comedy* in Cary's translation had been published in 1814.

planted with Trees of Firr, Cypress, Laurel and Pines, so singularly growing in formal order, as if some artificial cunning hand had planted them, the Sun hardly piercing through their Branches from the top to the bottom, even at the highest, or any part of his course.

The emphasis in Boccaccio is all on the privacy that the wood affords, and there is no hint of gloom or fear. But by the alchemy of Keats's imagination this sombre, sunless grove, 'the dark pine roof', ominous in its brooding silence, becomes 'a forest quiet for the slaughter' of Lorenzo, which is committed in 'the sodden turfed dell', conjured up by the words 'more deeply sunk than any other part of the Ground' in the story itself. At the same time Keats does not forget 'other trees' and through the agency of the ghost of Lorenzo he intersperses beeches and chestnuts. He also covers the ground with heather and 'red whortle-berries', just as he had lined the banks of the Arno with 'dancing bulrush'.

From the ghost we learn that

a sheep-fold bleat  
Comes from beyond the river

to his grave. This may be linked with his words in the next stanza:

I am a shadow now, alas! alas!  
Upon the skirts of human nature dwelling  
Alone: I chant alone the holy mass,  
While little sounds of life are round me knelling,  
And glossy bees at noon do fieldward pass,  
And many a chapel bell the hour is telling.

The two passages, taken together, indicate that the spot where he was slain, though solitary, is not too far removed from the haunts of men, and Lorenzo's words imply that it is within reach of fields and a chapel. The essence of this passage is found in the Induction to the eighth day, where Boccaccio relates how

The Queen and her Company, being all come forth of their Chambers, and having walked a while abroad, in the goodly green Meadows, to taste the sweeteness of the fresh and wholesome air, they returned back again into the Palace, because it was their duty so to do.

Afterward, between the hours of seven and eight they went to hear Mass, in a fair Chappel near at hand, and thence returned to their Lodgings.

Here again Keats adds details in the form of the sheep and the bees, evoked by the reference to the 'green Meadows', but one can perceive that he drew his first sketch from the *Decameron*, amplifying what he found, wherever he thought fit, and blending the scattered details into an artistic whole in the finished picture.

The removal of the tale from Messina to Florence was useful to Keats, not only in providing material for his descriptions but also in furnishing a motive for the brothers' hatred of Lorenzo. In the original their conduct was accounted for by the desire to inflict punishment on the employee who had seduced their sister. But in the English translation of 1620 the love of Lorenzo and Isabella was idealized. Consequently, the old reason would not do; a new explanation had to be found. As Florence had so long been renowned for trade and finance, Keats sought the motive in the ambitious minds of the Florentine merchants who were anxious to make a good match for their sister. Such a marriage is, of course, a common theme, but one cannot help noticing that shortly after the tale of Lorenzo and Isabella (*Dec. iv. 5*) comes that of Jeronimo and Silvestra (*Dec. iv. 8*) which has as its subject the parting of these Florentine lovers by an ambitious relative on the ground of a disparity in rank and fortune. By the machinations of his mother, Jeronimo, the son of a wealthy merchant, is sent on a journey from Florence to Paris, 'to gain experience in Traffick and Merchandize', and though her offence is less grave than the crime of Isabella's brothers, it leads to the same fatal result, the death of the two lovers. One is all the more inclined to think that Keats's 'Isabella' may have been influenced by this story, because John Hamilton Reynolds who urged him to write the poem was especially interested in the tales of the fourth day and himself wrote a metrical version of the seventh and the ninth.

Another possible affinity, this time of a minor order, is to be observed in the phrase that describes the plan of the brothers to marry Isabella

To some high noble and his olive-trees.

The association of high rank and olive-trees may be a reminiscence of the sixth tale of the tenth day where it is related how 'an ancient Knight named Signior *Neri degli Vberti*, forsaking then the City with all his Family and great store of Wealth' bought some land covered with olives and other trees and laid out a garden where he later entertained the King.

Once more our eye is caught when we read of 'the break-covert blood-hounds' (l. 221). It is remarkable, for whereas it alludes metaphorically to the chase, the bloodhound is not ordinarily used for hunting. The hypothesis may be put forward that we have here a vivid impression retained by Keats from one of the most famous tales in the *Decameron*, the eighth of the fifth day.<sup>1</sup> The vision seen by Anastasio of Guido's vengeful ghost, pursuing with his hounds the woman who had been

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that Dryden, when dealing with the same incident in 'Theodore and Honoria', speaks of 'Mastiffs' and 'Hell-hounds'.

so obdurate in her lifetime, is thus depicted in the version that Keats read:

he looked amazingly round about him, and out of a little Thicket of Bushes and Briars round ingirt with spreading Trees, he espied a young Damosel come running towards him, Naked from the middle upward, her Hair lying on her Shoulders, and her fair Skin rent and torn with the Briars and Brambles, so that the blood ran trickling down mainly, she weeping, wringing her Hands, and crying out for mercy so loud as she could. Two fierce Blood-Hounds also followed swiftly after, and where their Teeth took hold, did most cruelly bite her.

Not less memorable is line 288, where the voice of Lorenzo's ghost is compared to 'hoarse night-gusts sepulchral briars among'. The simile is as striking as it is unusual. We are perhaps at first disposed to interpret 'sepulchral briars' as referring to some neglected churchyard. However, there are two of Boccaccio's tales which may have been the starting-point. One is the story of Titus and Gisippus (*Dec. x. 8*), in which the English version of 1620 describes the nocturnal wanderings of the despairing Gisippus in Rome and his ultimate arrival in 'an old ruinous part of the City, over-spread with Briers and Bushes, and seldom resorted unto by any; where finding a hollow Cave or Vault, he entred into it' and later witnessed a quarrel between two robbers of whom one was slain. The other tale is the first of the fourth day and so in close proximity to that of Lorenzo and Isabella. Here we read how Lorenzo makes his way by night through 'a vent-light . . . overgrown with briars and bushes' to the cave which gives him access to Ghismonda. It is on emerging from this desolate spot on the hill-side that he is seized and led away to a cruel death. In each case we have the association of a cave with briars, night, and death. The sound of the wind that Keats evokes, in either the one setting or the other, would complete the powerful simile.

It is not unlikely that the allusion in the preceding stanza to the way in which the forest tomb had taken 'the soft lute' from Lorenzo's voice is a lingering echo from Boccaccio's work. It is true that such a metaphor might be inspired by many a passage in English poetry. But if at the time when 'Isabella' was composed, Keats's memory was tingling with fresh impressions of the whole *Decameron*, they may well have provided the stimulus, for the lute is heard again and again in the links between the tales, and in the seventh story of the tenth day it combines with the voice of Manutio to cast such a spell over the listeners that they seem 'rather Statues, than living men'.

By contrast, the ghittern is seldom played. It is therefore all the more remarkable that in his tribute to Boccaccio Keats should join it with his name (l. 150):

Now they can no more hear thy ghittern's tune.

The word occurs only in Day 9, Tale 5, and it would appear that this story must have contained some feature to hold Keats's attention. It tells of the love of Calandrino for Nicholetta and how he tried to woo her:

On the morrow morning carrying his Gittern thither with him, to no little delight of his Companions, he both played and sung a whole Bed-role of Songs, not addicting himself to any work all the day; but loytering fantastically, one while he gazed out of the window, then ran to the gate, and oftentimes down into the Court, only to have a sight of his Mistress.

Calandrino is a burlesque figure, the butt of his friends, and Boccaccio's treatment is farcical. Nevertheless, one wonders whether this scene, transmuted so as to harmonize with the ardent devotion of Lorenzo, did not inspire the Pre-Raphaelite picture of stanza xxv:

And as he to the court-yard pass'd along,  
Each third step did he pause, and listen'd oft  
If he could hear his lady's matin-song,  
Or the light whisper of her footstep soft.

If we accept the possibility that Keats's reading of the *Decameron* was not confined to one tale and that he came to the task of relating the fortunes of Lorenzo and Isabella with his mind full of associations derived from other parts of the work, we shall be in a better position to understand how he handled the theme. The shifting of the scene from Messina to Florence, otherwise a complete mystery, is given a reasonable explanation, providing as it does some material for the natural background with which Keats, like so many of his contemporaries who turned Boccaccio's tales into verse, adorned the story. However, one cannot fail to note that he never lets the description run riot; it is always subordinate to the main design. In this artistic control and also in his command of the vivid phrase Keats rises superior to them all.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### A NOTE ON THE *REVELATIONS* OF JULIAN OF NORWICH

THE *Revelations* of Julian of Norwich present a difficulty which may be thus briefly stated. The earliest extant manuscript (Br. Mus. Addit. 37790) offers a text of the *Revelations* which is considerably shorter and differs materially from the text given by the remaining three extant manuscripts<sup>1</sup>—notably, as its first (and, to date, only) editor has pointed out—they 'have in them far larger elements of subsequent study and meditation'.<sup>2</sup> Harford concluded that this shorter version 'is what might be called the "first edition" of the *Revelations*, and the longer form is the outcome of the twenty years' subsequent meditation, thought and experience, referred to in the 51st and in the last<sup>3</sup> chapters of the later version. It has been suggested that it was *abbreviated* from them: it is here maintained that they were *expanded* from it'.<sup>4</sup> Hudleston, in his edition of the longer version, based upon Sloane 2499, wrote that he had 'come round to the view that Mr. Harford is most probably right'.<sup>5</sup> Dom David Knowles<sup>6</sup> expresses agreement in a brief but acute passage. Dr. H. E. Allen has stated her belief that the shorter version is the first.<sup>7</sup> But here is the difficulty. The Amherst scribe, writing in 1413,<sup>8</sup> forty years after the date of the 'Shewings', refers

<sup>1</sup> Br. Mus. MSS. Sloane 2499 and 3705: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds anglais, 40. The first two have been dated by Dom Roger Hudleston as respectively seventeenth century and early eighteenth century. Hudleston considered that Sl. 3705 was 'possibly copied' from Sl. 2499, 'but considerably modernised in spelling and language', though it has some 'readings peculiar to itself' [*Revelations of Divine Love* (London, 1927), p. vi]. Addit. 37790 is mid-fifteenth century: Paris, sixteenth century. A fourth manuscript mentioned by Tersteegen as in the possession of Pierre Poiret is now lost. Dr. B. J. Timmer was kind enough to institute a search for it on my behalf in the Royal Library at The Hague, and in other Dutch libraries: but no trace of this manuscript has been found.

<sup>2</sup> *Comfortable Words for Christ's Lovers*, ed. by the Rev. Dundas Harford (Lond. [1911]), p. 12. The manuscript had come to notice in 1909 when it was bought by the British Museum at Lord Amherst's sale. It is here referred to as 'Amherst'.

<sup>3</sup> In the 51st chapter of the longer version, Julian speaks of 'XX yeres after the tyme of the shewing save iii monethis': and, in the last chapter, 'XV yer after and more' (MS. Sloane 2499, ff. 34<sup>r</sup> and 57<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., p. xiv.

<sup>6</sup> *The English Mystics* (London, 1927), pp. 133–4.

<sup>7</sup> *The Book of Margery Kempe*, i (E.E.T.S., 1940), p. 257. Dr. Allen announced a treatment of Julian to appear in the second volume of this edition.

<sup>8</sup> Harford (op. cit., p. 7) first pointed out Blomefield's error [*An Essay towards a Topographical History of . . . Norfolk*, ii (1745), p. 546] in transcribing the date of the scribal introduction as MCCCCXLII for MCCCCXIII. 'This error', as Harford remarks, 'has misled all later writers.' Later editors of the *Revelations* have not acknowledged their indebtedness to Harford in this particular. Unfortunately, the error persists (together with other inaccuracies) in the notices given in *D.N.B.*, *C.B.E.L.*, and the *Oxford Companion to*

to Julian as still alive. Why should he, as Hudleston observes, 'have preferred to give the first and shorter account of the *Revelations* rather than the fuller one, which was presumably in existence at the date in question, seeing that the most important of the additions is definitely stated to have been given "twenty years save three months after the original vision" '?<sup>1</sup> Hudleston left the question unanswered. The hypothesis here offered is that Amherst preserves the first and probably the only account of the 'Shewings' *made public* in Julian's lifetime.

The Amherst scribe's choice is explicable only on three assumptions—that in 1413: (1) the longer version did not exist; (2) it existed but he did not know of it; (3) its existence had not been made known by the author. Of these assumptions, the first, as Hudleston observes, is scarcely tenable;<sup>2</sup> and the second, I think, inherently unlikely. If the longer version did exist in 'public' form the Amherst scribe, it may be presumed, would have known of it and would certainly have preferred it. We are left then with the third hypothesis, that the longer version existed but its existence was not made known. This would account for the scribe's choice: how does it fall in with what we know of the nature of the work and what we may infer concerning the method of composition?

I have made a distinction between the mere existence of a work and its 'public' existence. Clearly, this applies to work in all epochs, both before and after the era of printing. The work 'exists' in the first sense when it has been completed (with whatever degree of satisfaction to the author): it exists in the second sense only when it has been delivered to its predestined audience (after printing, to the world at large). If we apply this elementary distinction to the *Revelations*, our assumption made *a priori* to meet the otherwise puzzling choice of the scribe receives confirmation from the content and method of the longer version, the work 'unpublished' in 1413. For the longer version differs from the shorter precisely in point of 'far larger elements of subsequent study and meditation'. More, the longer version, proceeding from a lifetime's profound meditation is in a sense never finished. The last chapter opens: 'This booke is begunne be gods gift and his grace, but it is not yet performid as to my syte.'<sup>3</sup> Our original assumption is therefore strengthened. It may well be that the longer

*English Literature*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1946). In all these standard compilations, Julian still appears as a possible centenarian. J. E. Wells, *Sixth Supplement to a Manual of . . . Middle English* (New Haven, 1935), gives the true date of Amherst: 'The Amherst MS. is now Br. Mus. Addit. 37790 (1413) and preserves the shorter version which Hartford [sic] believed to be the original form': but unfortunately there is no specific amendment of the statement in the *Manual* (p. 464) that Julian 'is said to have lived until 1443'.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. xv.

<sup>2</sup> It is of course just possible that Julian did not write of her later experiences until after 1413; but the extreme unlikelihood of this supposition will hardly recommend it.

<sup>3</sup> MS. Sloane 2499, f. 57<sup>r</sup>.

version remained unknown until at or after Julian's death. As our reason then, for this state of affairs, we may with tolerable confidence give the very nature of the work.

There is, however, a third line of argument which may be thought to strengthen the case here presented. Accounts of mystical experience are not to be made public until after very careful examination by religious superiors. It may well be that no version other than that sanctioned could be put out before it in its turn had been examined.<sup>1</sup> We do not know whether Julian received the 'Shewings' before or during her life as an anchoress;<sup>2</sup> but a guess might be cautiously entertained. Julian's earnest desire for a fuller realization of The Passion, and for an almost mortal illness certainly bespeaks a spiritual crisis. If she were not at this time an anchoress,<sup>3</sup> she may have conceived these desires as a test of her vocation for that state. This desire she humbly submits to the Divine Will: but her third petition is asked 'without any condition'. The desire for an assurance is at first unfulfilled; and within six months has been resigned. And then there occur the Revelations, which fulfil all her three desires and, we may infer, confirm the resolution to embrace the religious state. Now, if the foregoing assumption about the place in Julian's career of her spiritual crisis is correct, she may be presumed to have given some account of her 'Shewings' as evidence of the sincerity of her desire to embrace the state of anchoress. Equally, if the assumption be mistaken, and the 'Shewings' took place after her admission to the anchor-hold, she may still be presumed to have furnished her superiors with some account of her experience. In either case, we should expect a version whose primary qualities of execution were simplicity and brevity, and, where content is concerned, an emphasis on what had been revealed as distinct from the author's meditation upon it. These are the qualities of Amherst. The 'official' version, written simply and without comment for its evidential

<sup>1</sup> Dr. H. E. Allen, speaking of the fifteenth-century English translations of mystical works, gives her opinion that 'English religious women and lay readers of both sexes . . . may be said to have been hitherto sedulously protected against the temptation to strive towards experience of this type, for three centuries or more' (op. cit., p. lxvii).

<sup>2</sup> We do not of course know that Julian was a *nun*; unless, as Hudleston and Knowles both remark, weight be given to her citation of Gregory's Life of S. Benedict (Hudleston, op. cit., p. xii; Knowles, op. cit., p. 132).

<sup>3</sup> Sr. Anna Maria, C.P., who is preparing a full edition of the *Revelations*, points out to me that Julian refers to the ages of thirty and thirty and a half as 'youth' (Sl. 2499, Chs. ii and iii). I am inclined to take the reference in Ch. xiv to *her* youth as meaning this age: when she goes on, in that chapter, to commend those who offer *their* youth to God, we may understand the term in its more usual, narrower application. There is no need, I feel, to take her allusions to her own 'youth' as referring beyond the date of her mystical experience to a spiritual life led from childhood; or to equate 'youth' with the state of being 'young in virtue' (i.e. not proficient in the spiritual life). Sr. Anna Maria favours the second interpretation.

value, remains the only account of Julian's 'Shewings' known throughout her lifetime. Whether the primary responsibility for this lies with Julian's ecclesiastical superiors, as a matter of prudence, or whether with the author herself, in her profound modesty and continuous quest for the truth, can hardly be decided. I am inclined myself to place the emphasis on the first; at least, in initiating a silence which Julian herself would hardly be likely to resent. But we know too little of the practice of ecclesiastical superiors in such cases:<sup>1</sup> certainly it seems legitimate to infer that prudence might well be a guiding consideration if the 'public' existence of a fuller version of the *Revelations* did come under consideration. But it may well be that no such question arose. The author may have been content humbly to contemplate what had been shown and to compare its import with the teachings of authority. Certainly this was the process that led to the mature version; the author became aware, as Harford points out, of 'a process of "development" by which the original revelations were enlarged to the dimensions shown in the longer (and later) versions'.<sup>2</sup> So the picture of Julian, as Margery Kempe shows her, late in life, is of one who gives good counsel from a developed acquaintance with the Scriptures.<sup>3</sup> If what I have conjectured is anywhere near the truth, Amherst preserves for us the first impact of a vision which is to remain with the author for the rest of her life, absorbing her in the profoundest contemplation of the Love of God; much as the A-Text of *Piers Plowman* communicates the first awakening to a moral truth which is to tease the poet throughout his earthly days into elaborating the threefold way of Christian living.

JOHN LAWLOR

<sup>1</sup> Sr. Anna Maria reminds me that the attitude of religious superiors in such cases is one of rigorous secrecy. References to how visionaries are to be 'tried' are, of course, plentiful.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 11. The three stages are given in Ch. li of the longer version; they are 'iii propertes in which I am sum dele esyd. The frest is the begynnyng of techyng yt I understdot therein in the same tyme; the ii is the inward lernyng that I have vnderstdyn therein sithen; the iii al the hole revelation from ye begynnyng to the end, yt is to sey of this boke, which our Lord God of his goodnes bryngyth oftentymes frely to the syte of myn vnderstdondyn. And these iii arm so onyd as to my vnderstdondyn that I cannot ner may depart them. And be these iii as on I have techyng wherby I owe to leyvyn and trostyn in our Lord God, that of the same godenes yt he shewid it, and for the same end, he shal declaryn it to us whan it is his wille.' The passage continues with the account of the 'techyng inwardly' that occurred 'XX yeres after the tyme of the shewing save iii monthis' (MS. Sloane 2499, ff. 33<sup>v</sup>-34<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>3</sup> *The Book of Margery Kempe*, i. 42-3. 'Throughout this discourse of Julian's runs a good deal of Scriptural phraseology in solution' (n. ad loc.). The contrast in this respect with the *Revelations*, pointed out by Mr. Coleman [*English Mystics of the Fourteenth Century* (London, 1938), p. 163] and referred to in Dr. Allen's note, is valuable confirmation of Julian's expressed desire, 'I desired often times to witten what was our Lord's mening'.

## THE SHAKESPEARIAN HEROIC VAUNT

TENNYSON, following Dante, sings that 'a sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things', and it seems that Shakespeare may have held much the same view, for several of the great tragedies employ a subtle and moving device by which the hero, reduced to utter impotence and with nothing but destruction before him, is made to recall the personal triumphs of past times. The clearest absolute example of this manifestation of the tragic *vßpis* is, perhaps, that found at the end of *Coriolanus*, where the hero rounds on Aufidius with:

If you have writ your annals true, 'tis there,  
 That, like an eagle in a dove-cote, I  
 Flutter'd your Volscians in Corioli:  
 Alone I did it. Boy!

(v. vi. 114-17)

At first sight it looks as if Shakespeare may have picked up a hint from Marlowe. Tamburlaine dies boasting of past conquests, and Barabas of past crimes. The effect, however, is not at all the same, mainly because the terror of their deeds, which has been over-emphasized, is not mitigated by a corresponding measure of pity. An effect more closely resembling the Shakespearian one is, however, achieved and brilliantly pressed home in *Edward the Second*, when the doomed king cries:

Tell Isabel the Queen, I look'd not thus,  
 When for her sake I ran at tilt in France;  
 And there unhors'd the Duke of Clermont.

(2516-18)

The haunting pity of these lines when viewed in their proper context could hardly be bettered, except by Shakespeare; and it is quite possible that it was precisely here that Shakespeare recognized a powerful tragic effect which he later used for his own purposes. But the *words* which he usually employs are not Marlowe's, and once or twice he falls back on a set verbal formula that is especially interesting because its origins seem to be anything but tragic.

In *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon*, which was written at some time before 1589,<sup>1</sup> Henry Porter assaulted his audience with that remarkable serving-man, Dick Coomes, with his 'sword-and-buckler voice and his swounds and sblood words'. Coomes is evidently a variant, at some removes from the original, of Plautus' *miles gloriosus*,<sup>2</sup> and, in practically every

<sup>1</sup> For details of this dating see my 'Notes on Henry Porter', *M.L.R.*, xxxv (1940), 517-21.

<sup>2</sup> Porter certainly had a type in mind, but the presentation is realistic rather than literary. There is no evidence of a direct debt to Plautus' comedy.

speech, he shows himself to be vainglorious and minatory. From time to time it is his custom to hark back to the good old days of sword and buckler fighting, and among his retrospective utterances we find:

Ha, I have seen the day I could have danced in my fight, one, two, three, four, and five, on the head of him; six, seven, eight, nine, and ten on the sides of him; and, if I went as far as fifteen, I warrant I showed him a trick of one-and-twenty; but I have not fought this four days, and I lack a little practice of my ward.

(2382-7)

It is the phrasing and the tenor of the first part of this speech that we usually find in Shakespeare.

In the course of an investigation of Shakespeare's debt to his predecessor I have found that Porter's influence is apparent in *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *King Lear*,<sup>1</sup> and it so happens that each of these plays affords a sufficiently close parallel to Coomes's speech. That in *Romeo and Juliet* is the least relevant since the recollection is of something other than fighting: Capulet simply recalls youthful flirtations:

I have seen the day  
That I have worn a visor and could tell  
A whispering tale in a fair lady's ear,  
Such as would please: 'tis gone, 'tis gone, 'tis gone.

(I. v. 23-6)

In *The Merry Wives* Shallow furnishes a much more exact parallel:

I have seen the time, with my long sword I would have made you four tall fellows skip like rats.

(II. i. 235-7)

The Porter echoes in *King Lear* are less incongruous than they may seem, for they are confined, almost exclusively, to the speeches of Kent, who, when he assumes the role of Caius, assumes also the profession, temperament and speech-habits of Dick Coomes. The relevant parallel passage, however, belongs not to Kent but to Lear:

I have seen the day, with my good biting falchion  
I would have made them skip: I am old now,  
And these same crosses spoil me.

(V. iii. 276-8)

This is very close to both Coomes and Shallow, and the wording is still Porter's, but the way in which it has become Shakespearian in spirit is readily perceptible. Capulet, Shallow, and Lear have old age in common, and Shakespeare has clearly come to regard this kind of self-flattering

<sup>1</sup> This is not, I think, a completely adequate statement of the relationship of *The Merry Wives* to Porter's work. I prefer to believe that the lost source-play was Porter's.

recollection as something common to, perhaps proper to, old men.<sup>1</sup> In Capulet and Shallow it probably amounts to no more than that, and the implication is a comic one. With Lear, however, the vaunt is essentially tragic and is part of an infinitely wider context. It remains, at one level, a dotard's boast, but it also takes on a new and rich significance as the hero's dying vision of vanished glories. This vaunt, uniting Lear with all his yesterdays, is something which qualifies his present impotence and isolation, and renders his passing at once pitiful and triumphant. Shakespeare, then, has now charged his formula with the full measure of pity and terror, so that what has hitherto been, at most, a realistic comic device, becomes, in the fullest and deepest sense, a tragic effect. It is here that he blends Porter's phrasing and Marlowe's meaning, and makes, of course, a contribution of his own.

*Othello*, too, has the formula with precisely the same location, function, and effect:

I have seen the day,  
That, with this little arm and this good sword,  
I have made my way through more impediments  
Than twenty times your stop.

(v. ii. 261-4)

If, as many scholars think, *Othello* is the earlier play, it follows that Shakespeare's recognition of the tragic possibilities of his formula is not immediately related to his application of it to old men. If, on the other hand, we regard *King Lear* as the earlier, we are able to infer a less abrupt process of transference. The issue is not an important one, however, and does not seriously affect the main purport of our findings. Shakespeare, it seems, picked up his formula at second-hand,<sup>2</sup> used it casually at first, but finally transformed it into the very stuff of tragedy. In Coriolanus's outburst he retains the tragic spirit of the thing but has, at last, shed the phrasal formula.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

<sup>1</sup> I am much indebted to Mr. Kenneth Muir for the timely reminder that Shakespeare gives it extended treatment in *2 Henry IV*, III. ii, where Shallow prates of the wildness of his youth. Shallow does not there employ the verbal formula with which we are concerned, however.

<sup>2</sup> Its presence in plays where Porter's influence is evident is suggestive; but one cannot be certain that Shakespeare picked it up from *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon*. I have not noted it in other plays of the period. It has been suggested to me that the turn of phrase may have been in everyday use, but I think this unlikely. If it was current, its associations would almost certainly have been comic ones such as would have raised a laugh for Coomes, Capulet, and Shallow. But Shakespeare is scarcely likely to have given Lear and Othello a hackneyed comic phrase at the moment of their supreme crisis. Whatever the origins of the formula under review, what really matters is the treatment that it received at Shakespeare's hands.

## JULIET'S DAYS, HOURS, AND MINUTES

ONE of the most amusing pieces of garbling by the reporter (or one of the reporters) of the Q1 text of *Romeo and Juliet* has been passed over with inadequate notice by Mr. H. R. Hoppe in his monograph, *The Bad Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet'* (Ithaca, 1948). Since the passage has even been used by supporters of the revision theory, though it tells exactly in the opposite direction, it may be worth while to point out what has happened.

At III. v. 44-5 the Q2 text reads:

I must heare from thee every day in the houre,  
For in a minute there are many dayes.

For this, Q1 has:

I must heare from thee euerie day in the hower:  
For in an hower there are manie minutes,  
Minutes are dayes, so will I number them.

Mr. Hoppe simply comments: 'This thought [that of l. 45] Q1 inflates into two verses.' But it is something more than inflation, and casts light on the reporter's mental processes. He misremembered l. 45, and, on the 'sermons in books, stones in the running brooks' principle, reduced a paradox to a truism. But he was not quite so stupid as not to see that the line he had produced had no logical connexion with the preceding one, and attempted to restore the point he had destroyed by saying 'for minutes read days'. It is inconceivable that this sort of thing should be produced by a writer composing freely, but it is highly characteristic of one trying to reproduce someone else's work.

J. C. MAXWELL

## ROBERT LOVEDAY: COMMONWEALTH MAN OF LETTERS

No one could possibly claim for Robert Loveday a major position in English literature of the seventeenth century. And yet the fame that he earned for himself during his short life, and the attractiveness of his personality as it is revealed less in his translation from *La Calprenède* than in his letters, warrant for him perhaps more notice than he has received in the last two centuries. The writer of the brief article in the *D.N.B.* was not even able to furnish us with his dates; and Loveday earns no place in the index of Bush's *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*.

The Lovedays were an ancient family at Chediston (or Cheston) in East Suffolk, two miles west of Halesworth. There was a Roger Loveday living

in Chediston at the time of Edward the First.<sup>1</sup> They were probably the leading citizens in this village of scarcely more than two hundred people, except when Sir John Pettus, that stormy Royalist who had married the daughter of Sir Richard Gurney, Lord Mayor of London, was in and out of his estate at Cheston Hall. The grandfather, Anthony Loveday, had married Ellen, daughter of William Crow of Yarmouth. Their son, Henry, also married a Yarmouth girl, Alice Skarph. The children of this marriage that we know about were Anthony, Robert (our subject), and two daughters —Fenner and Jane.<sup>2</sup> Aunts, uncles, and cousins in profusion dwelt nearby; and Anthony appears to have made his home for a while at Barningham, Suffolk, about nine miles south-east of Thetford.

Because Loveday attended Cambridge during the Civil War there is no record of his having secured a degree. But at Peterhouse under the date of 'December 20, 1636' there is this:

Eodem die Robertus Loveday Suffolciensis annos natus quindecim educatus in eadem schola admissus est pensionarius ad primum mensam scholarium sub tutela D<sup>n</sup> Beaumont.<sup>3</sup>

If he was fifteen when he was admitted in 1636, he was born in 1621.

His regular employment in the early '50s was that of secretary to Lady Clinton in the family of the Earl of Clare in Nottinghamshire. Thomas Bailey, the historian of that county, describes Robert Loveday in these words:

About this time [entry for 1652] there lived, as an upper servant in the family of the Earl of Clare, at Clare Hall, (Thurland House) in Nottingham, Robert Loveday, a very extraordinary person for his station in life; being an excellent scholar, well skilled in the classics, and possessing a very ready pen. He translated the three first parts of *Cleopatra*, and wrote, besides, a volume of letters, both of which performances were in good esteem with the public and *literati* of his time.<sup>4</sup>

The Clintons were an ancient Norman family and evidently prided themselves on their knowledge of French.<sup>5</sup> Robert spoke French in the family and also acquired a good knowledge of Italian through an old Italian gentleman Lady Clinton hired as '... one of the best linguists in England'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Page's Supplement to the Suffolk Traveler* (Ipswich, 1844), pp. 583-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Bysshe's Visitation of the County of Suffolk*, ed. for the Harleian Society (London, 1910), p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Alfred Walker, *Admissions to Peterhouse, 1615-1911* (Cambridge, 1912), p. 58. Loveday matriculated at Peterhouse in 1637 [Venn, *University of Cambridge, Matriculation and Degrees, 1544-1659* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 433]. Cf. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1924), Part I, vol. iii, p. 107. As we shall see, Venn's death date for Loveday, 1662, is patently wrong.

<sup>4</sup> *Annals of Nottinghamshire* (London, n.d.), ii. 838.

<sup>5</sup> *Thoroton's History of Nottinghamshire* (1797 reprint), ii. 406-7.

<sup>6</sup> *Loveday's Letters, Domestic and Forrein. To Several Persons, occasionally distributed in Subjects Philosophical, Historicall & Morall.* By Robert Loveday Gent. the late Translator

Buying Cotgrave's *Dictionary*, Robert studied the two languages as hard as his duties would permit him. The Clintons were extraordinarily peripatetic, dragging Robert away from his desk to go to Bath, London, and to Land's End (where they had a married daughter), but Robert kept to his language work. Anyway, he loathed Nottingham.

To his very good family friend, Sir John Pettus, he reports that his studies have reached the stage where 'I am encouraged to publish' (p. 128). For practice he chooses 'a mad fantastick dream' from a French romance called *Francion*. But he soon settles down with La Calprenède's *Cléopâtre* (1647, 12 vols.), whose author was already famous for *Cassandra*. Before he died, Loveday translated and published the first three parts, calling his romance *Hymen's Praeludia, or Love's Masterpiece*. These were published separately in octavos beginning in 1652, then bound together. This was as far as he could go; and by tracing his disease as he himself describes it in his letters, we can see why.

He was suffering from phthisis or what he called 'a Heckticall condition'. In Bath he takes the waters 'for my head', according to the doctor's orders (p. 50). He keeps asking his brother Anthony, whenever he goes to Norwich, to get him prescriptions from 'the great Dr. B'—and the allusions to 'Dr. B.' in Norwich are so plentiful and of such a character as to leave little doubt that Sir Thomas Browne is meant.<sup>1</sup> There was no other 'Dr. B.' in Norwich at this time. Robert complains of the lack of followers of Aesculapius in Nottingham, and while he is travelling he is too busy to do much for his condition. He liked people; he drank toasts and smoked tobacco. Instead of resting he seemed to enjoy the progresses his employers took him on from one end of England to the other. It is little wonder—from this vantage point of time—that his tuberculosis grew upon him.

He writes to his brother: '... 'tis the custome of these Diseases to lye long a gasping before they dye, and like Candles new burnt out, leave some heat in the socket, ...' (pp. 61-2). The physic that his brother got for him in Norwich, by a miscarriage of mail, never reached him, and Robert writes: 'I think there is a conspiracy of chances that traverse the Cure of this unlucky malady ...' (p. 91). His mood alternates between Christian resignation and hope, but too often his very optimism is a symptom of the disease itself. He urges Anthony: 'If your Affaires shall call you to *Norwich* ... I would gladly have the opinion of Dr. B. from whose advice I fancy most hope of all' (p. 106). But to his sister Fenner: 'My old trouble still vexes me, and I am againe in Physick for it: it has cost me much of the three first Parts of *Cleopatra*. London, Printed by J. G. for Nath. Brook, at the Angel in Corn-hill, 1659. The reference above is on p. 105. Hereafter quotations from the letters will be from this 1659 edition, and will be incorporated in the text.

<sup>1</sup> In a forthcoming article I point out the connexions between Robert Loveday and Sir Thomas Browne's *A Letter to a Friend*.

money, and I think at last it will cost me my life, for the distillation has given me a Cough with a bad presage. Heavens Will be done' (p. 124). This is echoed to the other sister, Jane: ' . . . how the Divine hand intends to use me by that means, I am uncertain, but will learn to welcome the worst' (p. 142).

A crisis is reached when he receives a diagnosis through the mail from Norwich:

I would gladly find Doctor B. not mistaken in the situation of my malady, and I hope my experience will hereafter assure me, as now my observation begins to persuade, that there is no flaw in his judgment. I have a strong fancy that I shall reap much benefit from those lotions he speaks of, and therefore when you go next to *Norwich* let me intreat you to take a note of the ingredients from his dictates, . . . I intend not to straggle the breadth of a hair from what Dr. B. prescribes' (pp. 192-3).

But it is too late even for Dr. B. of Norwich to help him:

My old Cough, with a great cold to boot, do constrain me at this time to be bad Company, which you may easily perceive by the languor of my stile: this Cough I find has lately fed upon my flesh, & carried away enough from the poor store I had to make me doubt a Consumption; but whatsoever the hand of Heaven sends me I shall endeavour to bid welcome (p. 267).

The final premonition of death, with a dash of *spes phthisica*, is this:

I confess I do more than suspect a Consumption, and if that be designed to fetch me from this World, I think I shall go without reluctance; for I have already received enough of the Divine hand to make me admire his bounty: but I have fair hopes of a recovery (p. 275).

This is the last we hear from him.

Robert Loveday died in 1656 when he was thirty-five years old. In his brother Anthony's 'An Elegy on the Decease of his dearly beloved Brother, Mr. Robert Loveday', appended to the 1659 *Letters*, there are these lines:

But whil'st he lived here seven times five years,  
(but half mans age) for time lost no arrears,  
His industry did like a River run,  
No time allow'd to sin from Sun to Sun.<sup>1</sup>

If he was born in 1621, as the register at Peterhouse, Cambridge, shows, then he died thirty-five years later, in 1656.

Though Anthony's 'thirty-five years' may contain a literary flourish in the direction of Dante, in compliment to his brother's Italian learning, the date of death seems to agree with the evidence of the translations of *La Calprenède*. In 1654 all three first books by Loveday were published by R. Lowndes. The volume is dedicated, of course, to Lady Clinton, and

<sup>1</sup> p. 283, ll. 17-20.

there are commendatory poems by R. Braithwait, James Howell, John Chapperline, J. Wright, and G. Wharton. But in 1656, under the same title and with the same frontispiece, appeared the fourth part, translated by John Coles. In his dedication to Lady Jane Cheyney, Coles pays his sad respects 'to the politer Pen of the since deceased Loveday'. In his 'To the Reader' he explains that the fourth part was begun but—"tis my grief—not completed 'by the Elegant pen of the Ingenious Loveday'. And among the congratulatory poems by Sir Kenelm Digby and others, 'J. W.' (probably the J. W. of the correspondence and the J. Wright of the poems in 1654) asserts in a poem that Loveday before his decease persuaded John Coles to continue the romance. Alive in a preface dated 1654 and dead in another, dated 1656, Robert Loveday probably died in 1656.

We cannot close without some mention of his character and his fame. A well rounded, wise, sensitive personality emerges from his letters; he had a host of friends, and there is little wonder that they kept the letters Robert wrote to them. Collected by Anthony, the letters were published, as we have seen, first in 1659, in fairly obvious imitation of James Howell's *Epistolae Ho-Elianae*.

The trait of character that is most striking—aside from his cheerfulness, wit, and Christian spirit—is purity. Because of his sickness, his was an enforced chastity, to be sure, and yet the theme of chastity, as in *Comus*, runs throughout his life and work. To his friend 'Mr. W.' he wrote: 'All women have yet appeared so indifferent, as the whole Sex was never able to give me a passion . . .' (p. 74). That he would never taste the joys of mortal love was not one of his fears that he might cease to be, and there is no doubt that this purity, spiritualized as it were by his early death, attracted many readers.

La Calprenède's precious romance is a worship, almost, of Artaban's legendary virtue, but no matter how often Madame de Sévigné prostrated herself before this shrine, few would read it through today. Yet it must have seemed to many seventeenth-century English readers that there was a kind of providence in Robert Loveday's being its translator and then dying, unstained, at about the age of his Saviour.

An interesting passage in his letters is that (p. 149) in which he describes for his brother, as though he were composing a masque, the plan he has for the engraving prefixed not only to his own part of *Hymen's Praeludia* but to all the parts and editions that succeeded his. The engraving shows Hymen as the High Priest about to light an altar with hearts on it. But Cupid (Robert explains) stops him with these words issuing from his mouth: '*Nondum peracta sunt praeludia*' or 'It's not time to light your marriage taper yet for the wooings are not past' (p. 149). This refers, Robert concludes, to 'the unfinished Story, as well by the Author as the

Translator'. And that unfinished story—as in our attitude, I think, towards Keats—compels a feeling that is half pity and half admiration; in spite of the fact that we could spare twenty Lovedays for one Keats.

Whatever the literary and biographical reasons were, Loveday's fame grew. The celebrated artist William Faithorne made his portrait, which forms the frontispiece of the *Letters*. Under it are these verses:

Wouldst know whose Face this Figure represents;  
He was the Muses Darling, in whose Tents  
He Liv'd and dyde: And on whose Shrine was writ  
Here lies the paragon of Art and wit; . . .

That his *Letters* were in demand for a whole generation is shown by at least five editions of them: 1659, 1662, 1669, 1673, and 1684.

Long after the other translators were forgotten who finished La Calprenède's romance under Loveday's title, Robert Loveday's genius continued to shine. There is this announcement of a reprint of all twelve parts in the *Term Catalogues* for Trinity, 1684:

Hymen's Praeludia, or Love's Masterpiece, Being that so-much-admir'd [Romance], intituled, *Cleopatra*, in Twelve Parts. Written originally in the French; and now elegantly rendred into English, by Robert Loveday.<sup>1</sup>

But Robert Loveday, who translated only a fourth of this huge volume, had been dead for over thirty years.

In the next century, listing William Faithorne's 'fine prints'—in spite of Flatman's

A *Faithorne sculpsit* is a charm can save  
From dull oblivion and a gaping grave—

Horace Walpole itemized this portrait as of 'One Loveday, in an octagon frame, with six English verses, devices, and French mottoes'.<sup>2</sup> The motto was *Pour relever*.

FRANK LIVINGSTONE HUNTLEY

<sup>1</sup> Folio. Sold By T. Fabian at the Bible in St. Paul's Churchyard. (Arber, ii. 202.)

<sup>2</sup> *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, ed. Vertue and Wornum (London, 1849), iii. 912.

## REVIEWS

**Piers Plowman. The C-Text and its Poet.** By E. TALBOT DONALDSON. Pp. xii+257 (Yale Studies in English, Vol. 113). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. \$5.00; 27s. 6d. net.

For close on half a century the study of *Piers Plowman* has been hobgoblined by what now, by Professor Donaldson, is finally proved a heresy. Ever since the theory of its multiple authorship was advanced by the late Professor Manly of Chicago it has been virtually impossible to contribute to the study of the poem without one eye permanently cocked on the five- and even six-headed hydra that he and his fellow disintegrators had argued into existence. Some four of these six heads—their six names were A<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>2</sub>, John But, B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, and C—were reduced by the scholarship of Jusserand and R. W. Chambers to one, namely William Langland. John But was conceded a varying number of lines in *Passus A XII* as it appears in the Rawlinson MS., and the C-Text was ignored and left undefended. Even a Chambers could not fight on all fronts simultaneously, and anyhow (the excuse ran) the C-Text was poetically the least interesting. The disintegrators could have it, anyhow for the moment.

Their moment, however, is now over. Professor Donaldson has stepped forward as champion of the C-Text and has clearly demonstrated that it can only have been written by the man who wrote A and B. In other words, William Langland made *Piers Plowman*, A, B, and C; and that is that.

It is sad that Chambers did not live to witness the end of this controversy. I think it would have rejoiced him to see one aspect of his work so well completed and it would have warmed his generous heart to think that American scholarship had ultimately refuted an American heresy.

Great as is this achievement of Professor Donaldson's in freeing lovers of the poem from a haunting phantom that too often got between them and the poem itself, he has done far more for them. He has vindicated the C-Text from critical disesteem by showing the method and purpose of Langland's last revision, the main motive of which he asserts to have been to put the moral meaning of his poem beyond all doubt and ambiguity, even at the sacrifice of 'poetical beauties'; not but what the C-Text has many outbursts of new splendour equal to anything in the earlier versions.

In addition to these services to *Piers Plowman* scholarship which can hardly be over-estimated, there is much in Professor Donaldson's book that is welcome. It may be divided under two heads, useful statistics and new interpretation. Under the former I class his many pages of clearly arranged information only available elsewhere—if at all—in scattered articles: for instance, a classified list of the extant manuscripts; a table of the numbers of altered lines in the B and C revisions; explicit information with regard to the status of those in minor orders as affecting Langland; a bibliographical index, and so on.

But his new interpretation is of a kind and quality that gives food for thought and makes one hungry for more, sending one back to the poem with freshened

excitement. I can only mention a few of the topics he treats; he demonstrates the meaning of the vexed phrase *mijt of pe comunes* to be—as I have long believed—‘mijt of the community or commonwealth’ (i.e. *not* of Parliament); he gives new meaning to difficult conceptions such as God’s Minstrels, Recklessness, Patient Poverty, *Liberum Arbitrium*, and Hawkin; he has much that is new and important to say of the Three Lives, Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. Not all his suggestions are fully worked out and I do not yet feel sure what place they will have in the final interpretation—if such a thing could ever be—of the poem as a whole. But they all have something striking in them that deserves to be meditated and may well be fruitful.

In any case these are glimpses into a Promised Land whither, under the banner of Unity, Professor Donaldson has firmly guided those who have wandered forty years in the wilderness of multiple authorship, in the sad wake of Manly’s article in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*.

NEVILL COGHILL

**Shakespearean Comedy.** By THOMAS MARC PARROTT. Pp. xiv+417. New York: Oxford University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. \$6.50; 38s. net.

A new book from Professor Parrott is welcome, and the present volume is one of those urbane, comprehensive introductions to the study of Shakespeare more generally characteristic of American than of British scholarship. The quiet but constant humour that illuminates his pages is in peculiarly happy conjunction with his present theme; the lucidity is such as we have learnt to expect from this author’s other writings, not least from the two fine critical editions of Chapman’s plays to which so many of us are indebted.

The author has tackled unostentatiously a subject often avoided or, it may even be, evaded; we all find it harder to speak of Shakespearian Comedy than of Shakespeare’s Comedies. But Mr. Parrott, mildly surprised that we should find a difficulty (p. viii), passes quietly to the heart of the matter—not, it is true, in the form of definitions at beginning or end, but by implication throughout the book. The spirit in which he approaches his subject is perhaps best summed up in his last sentences, where, quoting Terence’s ‘*Homo sum . . .*’, he concludes: ‘It is a friendly genius, humane and beneficent. The words of the Latin comic poet are the final and perfect characterization of William Shakespeare, writer of immortal comedy’ (p. 408).

The principal tasks Mr. Parrott has set himself are three. First, the careful relating of the main comedies to their sources, in order to demonstrate the nature of Shakespeare’s art as it is revealed by the process of conversion. Second, the relating of the comic characters to the total effect of the plays in which they appear; to the quality of the comedy in those plays we recognize as ‘comedies’; and to the balance of the whole in the histories and in the tragedies. Finally, though in his book it is treated simultaneously, he traces the development of Shakespeare’s comic art as that, too, is revealed in the conversion of the sources and in the integration of the comic elements with each other or with historical

or tragic material. There is, for instance, a detailed analysis of Falstaff's part in the two plays of *Henry IV* and of the dramatic functions of the character (Chap. 9, 'The Falstaff Plays'), and though one may disagree with a specific conclusion here and there, one is in full accord with the general thesis, 'His [Falstaff's] role is essentially structural' (p. 237). The character of Polonius is examined in the same way, the author setting out to determine of what nature is the comic element in it (pp. 281-4) and what is the relation of this and other comic or potentially comic characters and passages to the total effect of the play.

But in addition to the main theme of the book there is subsidiary material of special service to the student who needs some guidance in relating the subject to its background or a brief reminder of what that background was. There is a brief but helpful survey, in the opening chapters, of the comic elements and the comic characters in medieval drama, followed by a similar study of 'Classical Form', 'The Romantic Spirit', and 'The New Comedy' (Chaps. 1-3). And this again is supported by a summary of Shakespeare's life which, though also brief, includes the findings of much of the biographical criticism available at the beginning of last year. Naturally there is no space for discussion of the more revolutionary theories.<sup>1</sup>

If there are certain points on which a reviewer is tempted to differ from the author, these are, for the most part, still *sub judice*. The present writer, for instance, disagrees with the relations between Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher in the 'new' drama which are implied in Chap. 12 (p. 375). Many of us regard *Pericles*, at least in the undoubtedly Shakespearian parts, as the first of the final group of plays, since it sets the key in which the next three are written. This makes it by no means certain that the 'new' style began with Beaumont and Fletcher, and leaves us free to conclude that Shakespeare was here, as in so much else, the leader and the innovator. Indeed, Mr. Parrott himself seems to prepare the way for this conclusion when he remarks, in speaking of *The Comedy of Errors*, that 'Shakespeare seems here to have shown his contemporaries the way' (p. 103). What was true at the beginning and in many later instances of technical and stylistic originality throughout Shakespeare's career may well have been true to the end.

'It is easier', says Mr. Parrott, 'to say what Shakespearean comedy is not than to formulate what it is' (p. 407), and his readers will be in full agreement with him here. Yet we could wish that, perhaps at the end of the volume, he had defined more specifically the absolute quality of Shakespearian comedy, defined it in positive rather than in negative terms. That the quality was clear to him is evident, both from the way in which he treats the material throughout his book and in incidental comments such as that quoted at the beginning of this review. He has given us a wise and humane survey of the field, guiding our

<sup>1</sup> There is obviously no room in a volume of this kind for references even to important theories concerning the authorship of the plays with which the author did not find himself in agreement, and these would necessarily be passed over without even a denial. This no doubt accounts for the absence, for example, of a reference, in the discussion of *The Taming of the Shrew* (pp. 144-53), to Peter Alexander's views on the relation of *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*.

thought to dwell upon the theme of Shakespearian Comedy rather than on that of Shakespeare's Comedies, but we could wish that he had carried the study that one step farther that we all find it difficult to take. Undoubtedly it was modesty that prevented him from attempting a task that might rank with those beloved of Yeats: 'Of all things not impossible the hardest.' But we regret a virtue that has robbed us of something that he might have done, and no man better.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

**Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and other Essays.** By LESLIE HOTSON. Pp. xii+244. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1949. 21s. net.

The essay which gives its title to this collection claims to show that Shakespeare's Sonnets were composed between about 1586 and 1589. It seems important to place this conclusion at the beginning of any discussion of the arguments which lead to it. If Dr. Hotson proves his case, we are to believe that the bulk of these poems were written at least five years before Shakespeare wrote *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *Romeo and Juliet*; that they were in existence, not for about ten years before their publication, but for about twenty; that for at least ten years none of them 'leaked' into print, as one or two did in *The Passionate Pilgrim* of 1598; that Meres, writing in the same year of the 'sugred Sonnets among his private friends', was alluding to poems and friendships which flourished in the previous decade, not in an interesting contemporaneity. We are to revise severely our impression of Shakespeare's development in the 1590's, and to conceive of these poems and the sentiments they profess as belonging rather to his middle twenties than to his thirties.

Dr. Hotson's arguments rest on the contemporary allusions he attaches to Sonnet 107 ('The mortall Moone hath her eclipse indur'de'), Sonnet 123 ('Thy pyramydys buylt vp with newer might'), and Sonnet 124 ('Vnder the blow of thralled discontent'). 'The mortall Moone' is made to refer, not to Queen Elizabeth, but to the Armada, which Dr. Hotson shows was imagined to have approached England in the form of a crescent moon. Since the Sonnet clearly alludes to some great national crisis such as that of 1588, it is difficult to reject the positive side of this argument; but it is not easy, on the other hand, to accept the negative side, which consists in denying to 'the mortall Moone' the sense which has always seemed most natural. One of Dr. Hotson's arguments is that Shakespeare would not have dared to mention the Queen's mortality. But the Sonnet was not, apparently, written for publication, and Spenser, far more dependent than Shakespeare on the Queen's favour, both wrote and published:

Great wrong I doe, I can it not deny,  
to that most sacred Empresse my dear dred,  
not finishing her Queene of faery,  
that mote enlarge her liuing prayses dead.

(Sonnet XXXIII)

Moreover, the phraseology suggests the triumphant re-emergence from an expected danger, not the unexpected total destruction which overtook King Philip's fleet.

Is it rash to suggest that the somewhat prosaic conceit of referring to the Armada as 'the mortall Moone' might have commended itself to some contemporary poets, but would not be at all in Shakespeare's manner? His great power of suggestion lies in his capacity to give almost excessive meaning to statements which, when we analyse them, are full of words and phrases to which it is difficult to attach precision. In the degree to which this facilitates the fantasies of moralists and metaphysicians, it makes difficult the task of reaching certainty as to allusions of the kind Dr. Hotson seeks. The difficulty pursues him in his comments on Sonnets 123 and 124; and some of his arguments are apt to be either strained or airy. If one grants that the 'pyramyds buylt vp with newer might' could well refer to the various Egyptian obelisks erected, or shifted, in Rome between 1586 and 1589, it does not follow that Shakespeare might not have found the image to his purpose at some time later than the date when the last 'pyramyd' was set up, or than the date of Pope Sixtus's death. Dr. Hotson assumes a quite modern measure of what is 'news' when he dates the Sonnet in 1589, because 'after the death of Sixtus in August 1590, the *newer might* of that powerful figure was a thing of the past, and the Roman pyramids were no longer either novel or news' (p. 27). The death of the Pope might have such an effect in Rome or in Italy, where immediate interests would be concerned; but is there any reason to think that Shakespeare's imagination worked in this way?

The way Shakespeare's imagination (and rhetoric) worked makes the task of interpreting Sonnet 124 by no means the easy matter Dr. Hotson maintains. He says that for the poet's contemporaries 'there is no vagueness or generality about the *childe of state* who *suffers in smiling pomp* and *falls under the blow of thralled discontent*'. This is plainly and exclusively the murdered Henry of Valois, King of France' (pp. 32-3). If those contemporaries who saw the poem at the time of its composition had no doubt of the references, that was because they knew what was just happening, or had lately happened, *not* because the language of the poem is such that it would suffice of itself to make all clear. It is indeed full of 'vagueness and generality', as we, who have no other evidence of its meaning, must be forced to admit. Dr. Hotson's argument is that it uses as an image the position of an insecure monarch, or other great person, threatened by the hostility of suppressed religious factions; and that this can refer to no other person or incident than the murder of Henri III, in 1589, by a Jacobin friar. We may admit that the political situation the poem uses is as Dr. Hotson describes it; but it does not follow that the reference to the murder of the French King is clear, for the political situation described was too well known, in both France and England, to give an unmistakable clue.

The book is completed by ten detailed essays, principally on Shakespeare's friends and associates in the last ten years of his life. A few of these studies have appeared elsewhere, but scholars will be grateful to Dr. Hotson for presenting them again in this more accessible form, for they contain an abundance of fascinating information on the men and manners of Shakespeare's world. Dr. Hotson's wide reading and intimate knowledge of contemporary records serve him better here than in his discussion of the Sonnets, where one cannot but feel that his theory runs counter to the probabilities.

F. T. PRINCE

**The Problem of *Henry VIII* Reopened.** By A. C. PARTRIDGE. With a Foreword by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. 35. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1949. 5s. net.

*Henry VIII* is the great testing-bench for machines designed to determine authorship by mechanical methods. So long as none passes the test (and evidently none has done so) the unmechanical scholar can have little confidence in such devices, no matter how elaborate they may have become—and they have indeed developed far beyond the Rocket stage represented by the verse-counts of the nineteenth-century designers.

These mechanics, however, were anxious to test not their engines but their unscientific intuition that *Henry VIII* contained the work of another hand than Shakespeare's; in other words, verse- and language-tests were devoted to establishing the only plausible explanation for the disunity of the drama, which was generally taken for granted. Almost a century of such testing, carried out with increasing refinement and occasionally with an element of the bizarre, has comfortably, though not uniformly, confirmed the assumptions of the investigators. But the case for collaboration is obviously enfeebled by demonstrations, such as those of Professor Peter Alexander, that anyone who refuses to make the assumptions can legitimately be stubborn about accepting such evidence.

Dr. Partridge is against the 're-integrators', and makes these assumptions—indeed, he uses his expert knowledge of general Elizabethan, and Shakespearian, syntax, accident, and vocabulary largely to strengthen the case of the Spedding school. But the fact that he does so does not destroy one's confidence in his findings; for one thing, his own statistical 'confidence-limit' is securer than any that can be achieved in a consideration of whole lines, since he is working with separate words. Furthermore, his aim in going over the same ground as the verse-counters is avowedly to try out his instrument; he is testing the machine and not the bench.

The results are very interesting. Fresh, apparently, from huge labours on the corpus and revisions of Jonson, Dr. Partridge finds that *Henry VIII* has 'stylistic strata', which are differentiated, not in time, as they are in Jonson, but 'by personal idiosyncracy'. So, the Shakespearian portions (Spedding's selection) show 45 uses of the obsolescent expletive *do*, against 5 in the ampler Fletcherian portions; and the younger man uses the expletive more 'correctly' than Shakespeare. Shakespeare uses the 'literary' *hath* 22 times, and *has* only 14 times; Fletcher has the proportion 2 : 33. The increasingly fashionable '*em* and *ye*' are found in these proportions to *them* and *you*: Fletcher 59 : 7; Shakespeare 5 : 23. Although 'the Shakespearian scenes are three times as prolific in colloquial contractions as those assigned to Fletcher', Shakespeare, like Jonson, evidently made something of an exception in the case of '*em* and *ye*', perhaps on grammatical grounds, and he is throughout the canon consistent in this matter. These figures are certainly striking. In the matter of syntax, Dr. Partridge is very interesting on Shakespeare's involved and anacoluthic constructions; he describes them scientifically, as many of us who recognize them perfectly well could not.

Dr. Partridge is here showing his paces; this is a suggestive rather than an

exhaustive study. He therefore refrains from any attempt to parcel out the play between authors, or to do more than strongly suggest that the evidence, dismissed by Alexander, is not the whole of the disintegrator's case. Incidentally he has shown how valuable this linguistic approach must be when conducted by so learned a grammarian. His long studies of Jonson's accidence and syntax will obviously be important works. Meanwhile, this essay is by far the most stimulating contribution to the *Henry VIII* controversy since Alexander's essay of 1930. But, as one who believes, with Dr. Wilson Knight, though on different grounds, that the play has imaginative unity and a defensible structure, I may perhaps express a hope that this further testimony on the side of dual authorship will not foster the illogic which infers disunity from the fact of collaboration.

FRANK KERMODE

**George Chapman. The Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies.** By JOHN WILLIAM WIELER. Pp. xii+218. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. 22s. net.

Mr. Wieler measures a proportionate increase of Stoic elements in Chapman's six tragedies, and argues that an ever greater inability to fulfil in the later plays the kind of dramaturgical promise shown in *The Tragedy of Bussy d'Ambois* must be due to it. For 'Stoicism is the negation of the tragic concept', and dramas substantially Stoic are non-cathartic, absolved from conflict, verbose, digressive; heroes like Clermont d'Ambois, who calmly withdraw from life's perturbations, are not of much concern to an audience—'no audience can be expected to take a greater interest in the death of the hero than he himself evinces.' Mr. Wieler's argument is most readily provable by the difference between *The Tragedy of Bussy* and *The Revenge of Bussy*, where the decline in dramaturgical skill does seem to be in proportion to the increase in Stoic material. But Mr. Wieler's application of vaguely Aristotelian canons is not enough to convince us that the *Byron* plays, which, as he shows, have much less Stoicism in them than the *Revenge*, are dramaturgically better than the later play. Mr. Wieler's proportionate scheme therefore falls to the ground, leaving us only with what we knew before: that the *Revenge* is very queerly distorted by the obsession with Stoicism, and that perhaps Chapman, like Jonson, thought that Aristotle and others should have their dues, but that if he could make further discoveries of truth and fitness he was not to be envied.

That Chapman was out to make discoveries Mr. Wieler's own analyses of *Chabot* and *Caesar and Pompey* forcibly suggest. On *Chabot* Mr. Wieler's distinction between the 'great' and the 'good' as Chapman formulated the contrast is in itself excellent. It is not, incidentally, necessary to accept Mr. Wieler's theory of progressive Stoicism to believe, as against Mrs. Solve, that *Chabot* in an unrevised form is the work of 1612: his other arguments are colourable enough, though it is fair to note agreement with Mr. Wieler's remark that he does not set about disproving any of Mrs. Solve's positive contentions, which have been accepted by Professor Parrott. The full chapter on *Caesar and Pompey*, customarily thrown unregarded into a corner, is also much to be welcomed. One

might indeed question the view that Pompey's temporary lapse from Stoicism is a dramaturgical flaw, forced upon Chapman by the exigencies of his historical theme, and one which, ironically, makes the inconsistent Pompey 'the only portrait of a Stoical man that our understanding can readily accept'. Could not Chapman have intended it that way? Pompey's apostasy was due to his disobedience to his master Cato; his recovered discipline makes his renewed Catonian faith admirably convincing. Chapman was at last learning how to put Stoicism on the stage; but Mr. Wieler, bent over his syllogism, disregards this and other pieces of evidence for the growth of a more varied and flexible dramaturgy that he himself is amassing.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Wieler should have been inhibited by his own thesis, for, in spite of its singularly lifeless style (which is perhaps complementary to this critic's virtual disregard of the poetry in Chapman), his book approaches some way towards a valuable modification of the current view of Chapman's last two tragedies. But Mr. Wieler explores Chapman's errant wilderness with such careful avoidance of its basilisks and sunning adders that we are drawn to reflect whether so severe a delimitation of theme can usefully illuminate a writer of Chapman's strenuous variety. Was the man who wrote *Eugenia* and 'A Hymne to our Saviour' ever a 'convert' to Stoicism, as Mr. Wieler states? Is even Chapman's use of 'Nature', 'Wisdom', 'Reason' bare of those overtones of meaning derived from the Christian centuries which intervened between him and Epictetus? After all, Chapman was not a Stoic but, at the most, a neo-Stoic: the distinction carries a burden of antinomies of which Mr. Wieler is too modestly unaware.

PETER URE

**Ben Jonson.** Edited by C. H. HERFORD, PERCY and EVELYN SIMPSON. Vol. IX. **An Historical Survey of the Text: The Stage History of the Plays: Commentary on the Plays.** Pp. xvi+732. Vol. X. **Play Commentary: Masque Commentary.** Pp. xii+710. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. 35s. net each volume.

The great work is nearing its completion. These two substantial volumes deal at large with the foundations of the text and subsequent editions, and with performances early and late, and furnish the commentary on all Jonson's dramatic writings. A final volume is to contain the commentary on the poems and prose works together with an index.

We have here the mature fruit of half a century of devoted study on Dr. Simpson's part.<sup>1</sup> And what a harvest-home it is! Jonson differs from most Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists in that his works are those of a learned writer, based to a far greater extent than most on the fruits of reading passed through the alembic of a capacious memory. And Dr. Simpson seems to have read everything classical, humanistic, and contemporary that could possibly throw light on

<sup>1</sup> I shall throughout speak of Dr. Simpson in the singular. It is manifest that the substance of the work is Dr. Percy's, and it may be assumed without disparagement that Dr. Evelyn's part has here been mainly one of consultation and revision.

Jonson's text and is able to quote passage after passage that Jonson recalled and maybe paraphrased in his work.<sup>1</sup> To say that Dr. Simpson was the one person in a position to perform this task is not merely to say that he has devoted the energy of a lifetime to its accomplishment; far more, he must be one of the very few people equipped by scholarship and perseverance to have undertaken it with success. In this respect I can only admire, I am myself too ill equipped to comment.

It is a little over three years since we were congratulating Dr. Simpson on his completion of the text. Considering the exigent nature of the work, it is no mean achievement to have brought out these exegetic volumes so soon. Our gratitude should be none the less sincere if here and there signs of haste are apparent. The writing has of course been done over a period of many years, and some duplications and discrepancies were inevitable. We might, however, have expected that Dr. Simpson's very able co-editor would have done somewhat more to impart a final polish to the work. Notes have evidently been jotted down as occasion served and have occasionally been printed as they stood without proper digestion. One trifling but tell-tale instance is at ix. 10: 'The reprint of the 1635 quarto of *Catiline* is recorded by Dr. Greg. It is a copy in the Harvard College Library...'. It is true that it was at Harvard that the existence of two editions dated 1635 was first recorded; but once the discovery was made other copies were immediately identified, and a glance at my *Bibliography* (to which he refers) would have shown that there were copies of the reprint, not only at Harvard, but in the British Museum, the Folger Library, and at Emmanuel. The same work would have drawn his attention to a variant in the title of the same play in the 1640 Folio, which appears to have escaped his notice. Again, I am sure that today Dr. Simpson would be incapable of writing the bibliographical nonsense that appears at ix. 52: 'A sheet of the Folio consists (usually) of three leaves of four pages each': 'sheet' should be 'gathering' and 'leaf' should be 'sheet'. At ix. 95 the remark that 'John Hansley's licensing note [of 1640 concerning *The Devil is an Ass*] shows that he knew nothing of the printing nine years earlier' carelessly overlooks the fact that the note was actually written in a copy of the print of 1631! At ix. 238 the droll called *The Imperick* is curiously described as an 'abridgement' of *The Alchemist*: it of course appeared in the 1662 edition of *The Wits*, not only in the 1672 reprint. A more serious confusion is at ix. 129, where a passage from the booksellers' address in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1679 is assigned to the preface to *The Wild-Goose Chase* of 1652, which leads to the assertion that the play was published by Herringman, Martin, and Marriot (instead of Humphrey Moseley) and that they were contemplating a one-volume Jonson a quarter of a century and more before there is any hint of such a project.

A lengthy excursus (ix. 74-84) on 'An Attack upon the Folio' deals with the vagaries of Drs. van Dam, Stoffel, and de Vocht. It shows Dr. Simpson in fine fighting fig, but he has trounced these gentlemen before, and they perhaps hardly deserved immortalizing in these volumes.

<sup>1</sup> If there is a general criticism to be made of the commentary it is that Dr. Simpson is a little inclined to think that by quoting a parallel to a passage he has explained its meaning.

The section dealing with 'The Stage History of the Plays' (but not the masques) relieves the individual introductions of lengthy accounts of revivals from the Restoration to the present day, but the separation of the discussion of the original performances from that of the text is not without inconvenience. Thus in the case of *The Tale of a Tub* the question of the satire on Inigo Jones and the revision necessary to meet the censor's demands are treated in one part of vol. ix (pp. 163-6) and the date of the play and its literary revision in another (pp. 267-75). This is the play over which I had the misfortune to disagree with much of Herford's treatment when writing about the first two volumes of this edition a quarter of a century ago. As regards the satire Dr. Simpson appears to have come to much the same conclusion as I did, namely that Jonson, when ordered to strike out the part of Vitruvius Hoop wholly, and also the motion of the tub, contented himself with removing Vitruvius as a character in the play, transferred the satire on Inigo to In-and-in Medlay (the satirical character of whose part Dr. Simpson is at pains to minimize), and retained the absurd tub—and got away with it! It is a remarkable story, but I know not, any more than Dr. Simpson, how else to interpret the facts. On the subject of date and literary revision Dr. Simpson accords my views more prominence than they perhaps deserve. But I am not sure he has quite understood them. After quoting (ix. 269) from my article he asks rhetorically: 'As for "raciness and gusto", pray are these senile qualities? And if there is no misplaced erudition in the play, why does that suggest late rather than early work?' But that is very much what I was arguing. Whether 'senile' or not, such 'raciness and gusto' as there is in the play is surely to be found in the passages of apparently late rather than early composition; and as regards erudition I was expressing surprise that it should be absent from apparently late no less than from early passages. In fact we both admit that the play contains both early and late writing: where we differ is over the relative proportions of the two elements or the significance to be attached to them. And I now think that I did less than justice to Herford's ingenious suggestion that when Jonson took in hand an old play partly in verse and partly in prose, he left the verse alone but rewrote the prose so as to produce a completely verse play. This will account for much that is perplexing in the text. Further, in view of Chapman's use of the word 'Reclaime' in his invective against Jonson on the occasion (see x. 695)—verses of which I was ignorant at the time—I should not now suggest that the old piece that Jonson refashioned in 1633 may have been other than his own. But the fact remains that, as regards actual composition, at least three-quarters of the text appears to be late, and that this makes its appearance at the head of the Jonson canon somewhat anomalous.

An instance of duplication is the account of the two states of Benson's small duodecimo of 1640 given at ix. 125, a book already described at vii. 552. Both accounts contain errors. In the earlier Dr. Simpson stated that in quire E the leaves cancelled were 9-11, he now says 5-8: in fact 5-11 were all cancelled. He also now makes the astonishing assertion that the inserted quire 'd' contains 'fourteen leaves', whereas in fact it is, like quire 'e', a perfectly normal sheet of twelve leaves, as correctly stated in his earlier account.

Dr. Simpson's relations with 'the nefarious Benson' are uniformly unhappy,

and his attack upon him seems to me ill conceived. In spite of *ex parte* allegations in Walkley's Bill in Chancery, there is no ground for believing that Benson acted otherwise than in the regular course of business and in accordance with the recognized practice of the time: he entered his copies quite regularly in the Stationers' Register, whereas Walkley omitted to take that necessary precaution, and to say, as Dr. Simpson does (ix. 126), that 'The true owner of the copyright was Thomas Walkley' is to import into the discussion a conception unknown to publishers of his day. Benson went to considerable trouble and expense to give readers a fuller text of *The Masque of Gipsies*, and the two manuscripts of it he possessed alike contained better texts than the one that came into Walkley's hands, one that Dr. Simpson has elsewhere described as 'execrable'. He must have forgotten this verdict when he implied (ix. 101) that Walkley's collection was 'set up from the poet's autograph'. By no possibility can this have been so in the case of the masque.

Dr. Simpson has assembled with admirable care all the documents in the Walkley-Benson dispute, but he proceeds to upset their interpretation by once more (cf. vi. 146) misdating Walkley's Bill January 1640 instead of 1641.<sup>1</sup> Benson's volumes had doubtless appeared some months before Walkley presented his Bill, and it was obviously Walkley who was infringing Benson's rights. Dr. Simpson also seeks to denigrate Benson by suggesting (ix. 126) that 'In March he planned a further' encroachment on Walkley's property by publishing other masques and poems, whereas the entrance of these (quoted, ix. 97) makes it clear that Benson had nothing to do with them. Prejudice appears again in the description of Marshal's portrait of Jonson in Benson's duodecimo as 'almost a caricature' (ix. 124). Marshal was not always a successful engraver, but the head is not badly drawn and looks if anything rather less bloated than it does in the original, the engraving by Vaughan that Benson used in his quarto volume.

Sir Kenelm Digby's connexion with Walkley's collection of Jonson's 'remains', the collection that came to be called the 'third volume' of his works, has long been known, but the matter is here much more fully documented than ever before. There is, however, one small point that should be cleared up. We are told (ix. 103) that a copy inscribed in Digby's hand 'for the Queene of Bohemia' (consisting of the second volume, with *Bartholmew Fair* dated 1641, and Walkley's third volume) had 'the Meighen title-page' of 1640. In fact, it lacked this title, which was supplied after it came into the hands of a London bookseller. The point is not without significance in the intricate bibliography of these collections. It may be true that 'Walkley's troubles probably account for the omission' to provide a title-page to his book; but this was probably from the start designed as a supplement to 'The Second Volume'. There may at one time have been an intention to print a joint title for the second and third volumes, but if so it was never carried out.

Dr. Simpson's tenth volume includes a valuable general introduction to the masques, dealing with the structure and scenery and the classical learning that

<sup>1</sup> It is dated 'xx. january. 1640.', which in a document of this sort can only mean 1640/1: moreover, it mentions Benson's entrances in the Register, some of which are as late as February 1640.

Jonson lavished on their composition. An interesting account of 'The Artificial Lighting of the Court Stage' is contributed by Mr. C. F. Bell, and there are biographical notes on the masquers. The individual introductions are also exhaustively documented from the official account books and from personal reports, which are largely concerned with the perennial rivalries of the French and Spanish ambassadors. I shall confine myself to a few remarks on *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*, since I happen to be familiar with it.

Dr. Simpson makes no attempt to amend the somewhat misleading account of the text of this masque that he gave in Volume VII,<sup>1</sup> and not everything that he has here added will bear examination. In one place (x. 612) he writes that 'Buckingham played the part of the first Gipsy or Patrico', elsewhere (x. 621) that 'the first gipsy is the Jackman': he was neither, he was the Captain. He repeats his assertion that Benson's first manuscript contained 'the Burley and Belvoir version' of the masque (ix. 125), whereas if there is one thing certain it is that it contained no trace of the Belvoir alterations: also that his second manuscript was of 'the fuller version . . . acted at Windsor', whereas it in fact contained a composite version. Quoting Chamberlain he says that Jonson had his pension 'from 100 marks increased to 100<sup>l*ii*</sup>' (x. 614): this sounds plausible, but Chamberlain seems to have written '200<sup>l*ii*</sup>' (such a misreading is easy in his writing). It can have made little difference to Jonson, whichever it was, for all pensions were suspended the next month (note on l. 596)! From the Newcastle manuscript Dr. Simpson quotes King James's verses to Buckingham on the occasion of his visit to Burley (x. 613). For some reason he has modernized the text, and he silently emends 'fatt' to 'fal', meaning presumably 'fall'.

Line 82. *cly the iarke*. Dr. Simpson quotes Harman, 'to cly the gerke, to be whyppe'. No doubt: but *iarke* is not *gerke*, it is a counterfeit seal, as appears from the note on *Jackman*, l. 57.

85. *Harman-beckage* is not the stocks but the constable, as the quotation from Harman makes clear.

89. 'no grunters, because of King James's dislike of swine'. On the contrary, the *grunters* were to be preserved for the royal chase.

100-2. *Barnabee . . . Gervice*. 'Evidently attendants in the royal gardens.' Hardly. Barnabee must have been a keeper of the King's game. *Gypsie Gervice* would appear to be one of the intended performers, like *Charles, the tall man*.

155-7. 'the allusion is to the Earl of Rutland, the lord-lieutenant of the county.' The Earl was lord-lieutenant of Leicestershire, not Rutland.

188. To say that 'the [Huntington] MS. has here a revised reading' is possibly misleading. It is a conjectural emendation of the scribe's, not a revision by the author.

663. *Buchclougs*, read *Buckclougs*.

678. 'the leaf containing [the Lord Chamberlain's fortune] was misplaced in the MS.' Certainly not in the extant manuscript, for his fortune does not occupy

<sup>1</sup> He incidentally corrects his statement that the Countess of Rutland's fortune does not appear in the first state of the duodecimo text, but not the equally erroneous statement that the Countess of Exeter's does not appear in either state.

a separate leaf. The fortune must have been misplaced in the loose leaves from which the manuscript was copied.

776. *Clave a Charle*, read *Clave a Churle*.

779-92 cr. note [the meaning of which escapes me]. To *make indentures* means to zigzag (though whether this can mean 'to beat about the bush' is another matter), but *drawing indentures* must surely refer to documents. I imagine that the whole phrase, 'never stand drawing Indentures for the matter', means 'don't bother about any formal agreement'.

931. *Money* is correctly recognized as a Jonsonian revision. But it cannot possibly be 'confirmed by the [original state of the] Duodecimo', which presents a much earlier text. Its 'Yes, a Bagpiper may want both' means 'both lips'—a manifestly untrue statement that was cancelled long before *Money* was inserted.

979. I do not think that a *Twinger* is 'one who . . . makes you smart'. Rather he is a thief who snatched jewels. Jonson elsewhere has: 'Twinge three or foure buttons From off my Ladys gowne' (*The New Inn*, I. iii. 80).

By the way, it would have much facilitated reference to the commentary on the plays if the act and scene numbers had been given in the headlines.

It would be uncritical not to draw attention to such shortcomings as those mentioned above: it would be ungenerous to pretend that they are anything but blemishes on a monument of patience and erudition. All serious students of English drama and literature will look forward eagerly to the appearance of the final volume, when we shall be able to write a triumphant *finis coronat opus* to a great achievement.

W. W. GREG

**A Strange Metamorphosis of Man, transformed into a Wildernesse.**

**Deciphered into Characters.** Edited by DON CAMERON ALLEN. Pp. xvii+64. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. 27s. net.

Professor Allen has made available one of the most attractive of the seventeenth-century Character books. *A Strange Metamorphosis* came late (1634) in the history of the genre (regarded strictly) when it might have seemed impossible to give the form any novelty; but the author successfully provided a new twist by using non-human subjects, animals, birds, plants—even mines in the earth are treated in the traditional manner. The book has been attributed to Richard Brathwaite, but Professor Allen is in agreement with Black and Boyce that the delicate fantasy of the collection puts it outside Brathwaite's range. The tone of Professor Allen's remarks on Brathwaite is rather irritatingly boisterous ('He knew how to use his eyes; he turned them on his soul—a rather gray bit of landscape, I should say'), and his account of the unknown author has sometimes an equally irritating poeticality ('He has seen the orchards after pruning time, and, as Herrick, he has been present when the burden of the vine was crushed in the press'); but he makes a convincing case against identifying the two men. More might perhaps have been made of the contrast of styles: Brathwaite is in general voluble, and his work in the Character mode tends to amplitude and narrative;

the Characters in *A Strange Metamorphosis* have something of the quality the author attributes to the 'Echo'—'no Ciceronian, nor apt for fluent stiles; but a *Lipsian* right, and fitter for a briefe manner of speech Dialogue wise'. The reader must agree with Boyce's conclusion (*The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642*, pp. 272-3) that Brathwaite crowded his material 'into something resembling the Character form not because of an especial liking at the moment for the Theophrastan genre but because it was handy and popular'. *A Strange Metamorphosis*, on the other hand, employs the form with conscious delight, the attraction being the strict use of the traditional manner for non-traditional material. Lupton in some of his Characters uses fanciful material, but he does not keep at all close to the Theophrastan form. The same may be said of the Breton of the *Fantasticks* from whom Professor Allen suggests the author of *A Strange Metamorphosis* took his cue. The latter work remains a unique contribution to Character-writing.

The editor provides all the annotation a modern reader needs, although one might complain that if 'Pinnaces' and 'flock beds' are to be glossed, such references as 'the Christ-cross Row' and 'the Counter' deserve comment. One promised note ('The Ape', note 3, on 'knap') fails to appear. The price of the book seems excessive even allowing for the devaluation of the pound.

A. K. CROSTON

**Biblical Criticism and Heresy in Milton.** By GEORGE NEWTON CONKLIN. Pp. xiv+137. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. 14s. net.

**Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition.** By F. MICHAEL KROUSE. Pp. xii+158. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for University of Cincinnati; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. \$3.75; 21s. net.

To read these two books in succession is to be presented with a nice problem of scholarly disagreement. Mr. Conklin is sure that Milton was an independent thinker who derived his theological views from the study of Scripture in accordance with the best learning of his age, intent upon the exact meaning of the sacred text in the original languages. For Mr. Krouse, on the other hand, Milton can only be understood, at least in the case of his *Samson Agonistes*, as the end-result of a tradition extending through the centuries. If political allusion and autobiography are to be found in the poem, their part is reduced to a minimum.

Mr. Conklin handles his subject in workmanlike fashion. He describes briefly the state of Biblical scholarship in Milton's time, with Selden, Pococke, and Lightfoot as the outstanding names in this country. He considers the evidence for Milton's own linguistic equipment and finds that in Hebrew he was 'a good general scholar'. He examines and rejects Harris Fletcher's contention that Milton was acquainted with, and influenced by, Rabbinic exegesis: he is satisfied that the allusions to the rabbis were only such as could be got from one of the lexicons of the time. Finally, in his examination of the 'heresies' in *De Doctrina Christiana* he confines himself to the rejection of creation *ex nihilo* and mortalism, the belief that the soul dies with the body. In each case, it is argued that Milton

reached his conclusions by his own judgement on the texts in question and their literal meaning.

Mr. Krouse is struck by the difference between Samson as we see him today, when we read *Judges* with critical eyes, and Samson as Milton has described him. The latter, he suggests, was not Milton's creation but a figure which had come to him idealized and transfigured by centuries of tradition, going back at any rate to the Epistle to the Hebrews, universally accepted till the Reformation as by St. Paul. He devotes several chapters to an account of this tradition and in a final chapter seeks to show how it accounts for much in the poem which would otherwise have less than justice done to it.

To the present reviewer, Mr. Krouse's starting-point is a mistaken one. He asks how Milton came to set a 'rough tribesman of Dan' beside Adam and Christ, and replies that Samson had been transmuted into a saint long before he reached Milton. But the 'rough tribesman' is a comparatively recent creation, he is what modern criticism yields by eliminating from the chapters in *Judges* the later material. For Milton, however, as for the average Bible reader today, the narrative was accepted as a unity, and the difficulties that arise when that is done were got over in certain obvious ways, as by supposing that Samson had special permission from God to do what would have been wrong in anyone else. This simple but admittedly unsatisfactory exegesis is resorted to by everyone who sets out from the literal inspiration of Scripture: no appeal to tradition is required to explain it.

The crucial point in the whole argument, and the one at which it breaks down, is reached when Mr. Krouse looks for the influence upon Milton of the traditional interpretation of Samson as a type of Christ. He is forced to admit that 'there is but one shred of palpable evidence to suggest that Milton intended the poem to call to mind the age-old correspondence between Samson and Christ'. What is this 'shred of palpable evidence'? It is Samson's 'trivial weapon', the jawbone of an ass! On the next page we are told that Milton's phrase 'could hardly have failed' to suggest to the reader the simplicity of the Gospel which triumphed over the wisdom of the world. And on the next page again we read of 'a strong probability' that Milton had an allegorical aim in writing the poem. A few lines later, this 'appears to be an inescapable conclusion'! The literary critic has done great execution with a most 'trivial weapon'.

At one point, however, Mr. Krouse has something of more value to offer, in his study of the epithet *Agonistes* applied to Samson. He traces this back to the tradition, at once Stoic and Christian, of the good life as one of conflict and of the good man as the victorious athlete and warrior.

In the chapter on Creation in Mr. Conklin's book the Greek verb *κτιζειν* appears several times as *χτιζειν*. Apparently a peculiarity in the Greek type used for the Columbia edition of Milton is responsible for this error. Mr. Krouse gives 277 B.C. as the date at which 'the biblical account of the life of Samson was made accessible to the Greek world in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament'. In this, of course, he is following a late legend. It is quite probable that a translation of the Pentateuch was made about then, but he would be a bold man who would fix a date for the other books.

E. L. ALLEN

**The Life of Reason: Hobbes, Locke, Bolingbroke.** By D. G. JAMES. Pp. xiv+272. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1949. 18s. net.

The aim of this study—an essay preliminary to one in which Professor James intends to deal with Augustan literature proper—is 'to recreate something of the intellectual idiom' in which Augustan writers, those at least of the early part of the period, were reared. Professor James has therefore selected for his discussion the work of Hobbes, Locke, and Bolingbroke, and from their work, particularly those writings and passages which treat of 'human knowledge, imagination, and religious feeling'.

Readers of Professor James's earlier studies, *Scepticism and Poetry*, and *The Romantic Comedy*, will recall that poetry is for him not primarily a function of language, as for the majority of critics since Richards, but a type of imaginative 'prehension' of experience, varying from work to work according to 'the differing proportions of imagination and intelligence in the creative acts that went to their making'. It is a mode, or better, an extension, of the normal act of knowing, in which perception, 'as it moves from being relatively passive' (the area of sensation) 'to being more active in prehension and to grasping and holding its idea', becomes symbol. Positively, symbol is a means of apprehending the object; in fact, 'it is the object as we come to know it in perception'. Hence Shakespeare's *King Lear* is not a prior idea of human life that Shakespeare had, formed into a play; it is Shakespeare's idea of life as he then—when he had written the play—perceived it: 'in it life became for him clear idea'. Negatively, on the other hand, symbol is the resistance of the imagination to the understanding.

Because what is imagined is not complete or perfect, imagination invokes the aid of thought; and in this way the mind achieves what are properly objects. . . . The imagination requires the intelligence, but is also jealous of it; while the intelligence, conscious of its power and easier articulation, seeks in vain to outstrip the imagination. And out of this tension symbol is born; for symbol is the difficult compromise in which the two come to some kind of terms, the agreed mode of expression which at once avoids conceptual ordering and definition, and yet precipitates the mind into the search for them.

This account of poetry as an extension of the mind's normal workings (to the subtlety of which, though its central propositions are familiar, the summary above does scant justice) is elaborated in the book partly for its own sake, but partly also to bring out the quite different views of knowledge and imagination held by the three Augustans. Professor James's treatment of these writers—possibly excepting Bolingbroke, whose doctrine, if it is as 'negligible' as he believes, it was clearly a mistake to pursue through nearly a hundred pages—is remarkable for its sympathy and discernment. He has a penetrating eye for the phrase or sentence in a man's writing which discloses the concealed contradiction, the dilemma, the undeveloped insight. His analysis of Hobbes's Janus-like sensibility, poised philosophically between materialism and rationalism, psychologically between fear (fear was his twin, he said) and a Renaissance *hubris* of intellect, gives us a figure more credible than the scarecrow author of set-pieces against Fancy (fountain of all our woes) which literary critics have lately been

presenting to us. Likewise, the two long chapters on Locke, necessarily intricate and sometimes even tedious in their intricacy, which seek to elicit the qualities and animating motives that make Locke 'best understood if we see him near to, if not in the company of, Pascal', dispel another stereotype of the handbooks: the Father of English Empiricism, the Apostle of Common Sense. Professor James does not deny that Locke was empiricist or Hobbes inimical to fancy; it is part of his purpose to assert just these facts about them; but he puts these counters back into context, where they become 'live thought' again.

It is, unhappily, necessary to add that *The Life of Reason* abounds in hints that bring uneasiness into one's anticipation of the book on Augustan poets and men of letters. For one thing, though it is plain that Professor James respects their achievement, it is not quite plain that he has cleared his mind of the cant that prevents one's understanding it. 'The detestable cocksureness . . . of Pope's *Essay on Man*' is a judgement which, if true in one respect, ignores too much. So does the notion that Bolingbroke, whose influence on Pope outside the *Essay on Man* Professor James exaggerates repeatedly, 'provided most of the ideas amongst which Pope lived'. (There are other questionable statements in Professor James's chapter on Bolingbroke, e.g. that Bolingbroke was already a 'deist' in 1714; and also one error of fact: Bolingbroke's *Idea of a Patriot King* was not published by Pope, only printed by him; in this case, the difference is important.) Equally surprising, especially from so sensitive a reader as Professor James shows himself to be, is the conclusion that Swift's Houyhnhnms are to be taken without irony—as Swift's 'silly dream of natural perfection'.

Most disturbing of all, though possibly to be expected from a critic whose theory of literature is so strongly 'genetic', so concerned with psychological origins, as Professor James's, is the exaggeration of the role of 'thought' in the formation of an age's sensibility and literary style. We meet the exaggeration in one form when Professor James says (more than once) that if only Locke had maintained the same fine balance of reason and faith in his chapter on enthusiasm as elsewhere in the *Essay*, Methodism might never have occurred: 'it is . . . a pity that he failed to insure [italics mine] that the succeeding generations would [sic] sustain a right balance of reason and faith, and that the Wesleys and Blakes, with their several excesses, should become necessary.' We see the same fault in another form, more pertinent to literature, when he remarks of one of Locke's omissions with respect to theory of imagination, 'this is typical of Locke and his age, and shows the blindness of the time to the aesthetic as a region of human experience.' That the omission was typical of Locke, Professor James's study shows. Whether it was typical of the age is quite another question, which he nowhere treats. And whether blindness to the aesthetic as a region of theory involves blindness to it as a region of human experience is still a third question, of which Professor James shows no consciousness at all. Whatever we may think about the state of the fine arts and literature in the eighteenth century, they were clearly not the product of a generation blind to the aesthetic *as experience*.

One is thus constantly troubled, in reading Professor James's essay, by an implicit assumption that the 'intellectual idiom' of men like Hobbes, Locke, and Bolingbroke, once it has been thoroughly expounded, will somehow 'account

for' the poetry of Dryden, Swift, and Pope. There is a relationship here, of course—though possibly less of influence than of common symptoms. But unless this relationship is presented with greater recognition of the limitations of ideas than there is evidence of in *The Life of Reason*, and with a fuller awareness of the claims of other equally, or more, influential factors (e.g. the strains of native and imported classicism, the new idiom forged by a new social order arising during and after the Civil Wars, the shifts and consolidations of the English language itself), the result is not likely to illumine.

MAYNARD MACK

**The Adventures of Lindamira, a Lady of Quality.** Edited by BENJAMIN BOYCE. Pp. xvii+167. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. \$3.00; 24s. net.

This anonymous novel of the early eighteenth century has been edited, with modernized spelling and punctuation and a critical introduction, from the only known copy of the first edition (1702), owned by the University of Minnesota Library. It takes the form of a series of letters from Lindamira, 'a Lady of Quality', to a friend in the country; and it was ushered into print by the revising and correcting hand of Tom Brown 'of facetious Memory'. Brown's part in the book was obviously small; his own preface makes it clear that he touched up the author's style as little as possible, and there is no evidence of the broad satire, the pungent expression, and the extravagant wit which are characteristic of his work.

Lindamira is a respectable, priggish young woman of the middle class, given to sentiment and moral reflection, who makes her colourless way through a series of mildly amorous adventures and emotional crises to a happy marriage. The plot of her story is weak; it is largely episodic, broken by inset letters and subsidiary narratives, decorated by analyses of sentiment, and brought to a somewhat forced end by a dubious complication of accidents. The style is stilted; the thought is commonplace; and the wit is sporadic and insipid. Only in her brief character-sketches of fops and beaux in the early letters does Lindamira sparkle a little; and when she attempts humorous narrative she slides into farce. Mr. Boyce claims that 'nine years before Mr. Spectator phrased the need of tempering wit with morality and enlivening morality with wit *Lindamira* appeared in print doing almost that'; but there is too much morality and too little wit to carry the reader on to the end of the story without tedium.

The significance of *Lindamira*, and the only justification for a new edition, is its historical position; and this position is made laboriously clear by Mr. Boyce. To describe this novel as an 'important document' for the study of English fiction, and to speak of its neglect as 'a lamentable state of affairs', is exaggeration; and Mr. Boyce falls a prey to incautious and unscholarly generalization in declaring that *Lindamira*, forty years before *Pamela*, 'offered a sketch of the theory and, with some romantic divagations, of the substance of the future, traditional English novel'. The book is interesting, however, as an early example of what Mr. Boyce pedantically calls 'the epistolary pretense', and as an attempt to adapt the techniques, style, and sentiment of the French heroic romance to an English setting. Brown's preface is, on this point, of some historical importance:

If the histories of foreign amours and scenes laid beyond the seas, where unknown customs bear the greatest figure, have met with the approbation of English readers, 'tis presumed that domestic intrigues, managed according to the humours of the town and the natural temper of the inhabitants of this our island, will be at least equally grateful. But weight of truth and the importance of real matter of fact ought to overbalance the feigned adventures of a fabulous knight-errantry.

The realism which Brown promises, however, is bogus; like Mrs. Behn, *Lindamira* is a student of the French heroic romances, and she selects some of the essential features of the prose romance, somewhat *démodé* in her own time, and builds them into an English setting where they are by no means in place. *Lindamira* is not a lady of the highest quality, and her romantic graces and sentiments are laboriously acquired without being fully and confidently possessed. She draws on two distinct societies—that which she reads of in the romances, and that of which she is so obviously a respectable and colourless product; and she often fails to keep her inevitably precarious balance between the exalted, ideal world of the courtly romance and the lower, real world of English middle-class society whether in conduct, sentiment, or expression.

Mr. Boyce regards this novel as 'a pioneering effort drawing on two kinds of literature'. It is more profitable, since *Lindamira* is but a strained combination of the romantic and the actual, devoid of literary quality, to take it as a social document. Much more important than the transference of which Brown speaks in his preface, and of which Mr. Boyce makes so much, is the narration of middle-class English amours in the style and according to the rules of the heroic romance; for *Lindamira* herself is as much a slave to social affectation and artificial convention, in both her sentiment and her behaviour, as any of the foppish, fantastical beaux whom she rejects. The plot of her story is clearly fictitious, and her debts to the literature of romance are obvious; but there is something much less fictitious, and much more important, in the sustained unreality of *Lindamira*'s imitation of the lady of romance against the background of London society and the life of the English country house, without any suggestion that she is only playing an elaborate game. This much is implicit in what Mr. Boyce has to say about the social station and the middle-class attitudes of the heroine; but had he been less concerned in weaving a web of literary history and criticism round a dull little novel which cannot sustain it, he might have written a less pretentious and more valuable introduction on the social context of the book. *The Adventures of Lindamira* deserved a new edition because of the scarcity of early copies and because of its social interest; but its reappearance might, with great propriety, have been planned on less imposing and expensive lines.

JAMES KINSLY

**Tobias Smollett, Doctor of Men and Manners.** By LEWIS MANSFIELD KNAPP. Pp. xiii+362. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. \$5.00; 25s. net.

In the preface to his long-awaited life of Smollett Professor Knapp speaks of his subject's death as 'untimely'. This small, initial shock causes the reader to

pause and rearrange his ideas. We have been used to regard the laborious life-work of Smollett as a completed thing, a copious outpouring, under heavy financial pressure, of all he had to give—picturesque scenes and characters, rollicking and gross humour, angry satire, and a journalistic readiness to embody topicalities. But 'untimely' implies a truncation of development as well as a shortening of life, and we are led to ask what signs of unrealized potentialities his books contain. The valuable biographical and bibliographical work done of late by American scholars has not been accompanied by any extended critical inquiry into the novels. It may be held that they do not invite such treatment. Howard S. Buck thought that it was only in his style that Smollett could be counted a conscious artist, and many have maintained that he never excelled the drive and impact of *Roderick Random*, his first book. It is possible, on the other hand, that his celebrated 'dash', the whip-cracking rattle and clatter of his pages, has swept us past indications that we ought to have observed, the more so because Smollett is not much read 'for love' nowadays. The difficulty is to distinguish between his plentiful and ingenious novelties—all his books contain effects that are strictly unique in his work—and the qualities of mind and art that undergo real development and might have contributed, had he lived, to further and greater achievements. This is not the place for such an inquiry, but when it is made it will be found that Professor Knapp has provided important material for it; for if it be true that there is little conscious art in the novels, that they are the scarcely premeditated expression of a personality, then biographical data about the nature and maturing of that personality are illuminating, and may help us to evaluate the integrity of some of its aspects. How deep were the springs of Smollett's once admired but now largely outmoded pathos? Was the streak of crude but strong romantic feeling, expressed not only in the 'Gothick' scenes of *Ferdinand Count Fathom* but also, on rare occasions, in unexpected imaginative similes, capable of refinement? The comic characters of *Humphrey Clinker* are more complex and more solidly based on probability than the eccentrics that preceded them, and some of them have genuine relations with each other, not merely collisions. In such milder airs as blow across this book from Brambleton Hall this development might have prospered. The notes of Dr. Gentili, who attended Smollett in his last illness, describe a physically but not intellectually exhausted man, and the combination which he observed in his patient of an ardent and choleric temperament with a reflective bent suggests that it would be interesting to trace these two strains, in their varying proportions, through his works.

The study that provokes these questions is strictly but broadly biographical. It aims not only at the statement and interpretation of all the facts that have been recorded about Smollett's life and surroundings, but also at the 'rehabilitation of his character'. It is a work of scrupulous and sober learning, informed by enthusiasm for its subject. Out of recovered scraps from Smollett's pen and researches into rate-books and other official documents, out of the results of bibliographical inquiries and the careful re-scrutiny of all known allusions to and accounts of him, Professor Knapp constructs the background of his life, and against the background a figure begins to take shape, different in some respects,

though not in all, from that which we thought we knew. His standing in the literary and social worlds was throughout better than has been generally supposed. He cannot ever have been friendless in London, like his Roderick Random, and, when he had established himself, he lived like a gentleman, in a good house, with handsome possessions. We see him voting at a Vestry Meeting at Chelsea Old Church and enjoying the garden that Jerry Melford visits in *Humphrey Clinker*. Professor Knapp, following Seccombe, claims for him a large measure of leadership in literary circles in the interregnum between Pope and Johnson, and instances his ambitious scheme for an academy of belles-lettres. This contentious man had a 'large capacity for significant friendships' and could win the devotion of his servant; he had also, it seems, a critical self-knowledge which condemned, though it could not govern, his sallies of rancour, a 'natural Horror of Cruelty', and a vein of melancholy, detectable at times underneath his turbulent narratives. 'Life is at best a paltry province', says Crabtree, and the note is deeper than that of spleen.

Professor Knapp does not profess to bring us closer to the figure that moves in his ample frame than the truth of biography allows, but he has been able to exhibit him more distinctly and in new and interesting attitudes. All students of the eighteenth-century novel are very much in his debt.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

**The Four Brontës.** By LAWRENCE and E. M. HANSON. Pp. xii+414. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. 25s. net.

Another book about the Brontës! What more can remain to be said about this family, the narrow confines of whose lives have already been so minutely studied? Mr. Hanson's answer to this question is ready. It is his purpose 'first to provide a full and accurate one-volume life of the Brontës, using all existing material. Beyond this, the aim of the book is to study in detail the effect of the Brontës on each other' (p. v).

He and Mrs. Hanson have succeeded notably in the former endeavour. If they have made no new discoveries of importance, they have at any rate taken full cognizance of the various books of fundamental research which have appeared since Clement Shorter's *The Brontës: Life and Letters* (1908). The work of G. Elsie Harrison, of C. W. Hatfield, of Fannie Ratchford, of M. H. Spielmann, of J. A. Symington and T. J. Wise finds neat and accurate synthesis in *The Four Brontës*. And since the Hansons are cool, sensible, and scrupulously exact in documenting every statement, their book may be recommended as the most comprehensive and reliable of guides to the vast maze of knowledge and speculation that exists regarding the Brontës.

Only because the Hansons' narrative is otherwise so complete do I think the following omissions worth recording. They make no use of George Smith's authoritative account of Charlotte's visits to London, first published in the *Cornhill Magazine* (December 1900) and later included in the privately printed *George Smith: a Memoir with Some Pages of Autobiography* (1902); as a consequence their story of Charlotte's later years suffers in vividness and authenti-

city. Nor do they list in their census of Brontë manuscripts 'A Word to the "Quarterly"', a preface to *Shirley* dated 'Aug<sup>st</sup> 29<sup>th</sup> 1849' in which 'Curer Bell' replies to the severest critic of *Jane Eyre*. This never-printed preface survives in the collection of Mrs. Reginald Smith of London.

It cannot be said that the Hansons' attempt 'to study in detail the effect of the Brontës on each other' has been equally rewarding. Indeed, this aim occasions a dissipation of dramatic interest which, together with their avoidance of humour and pathos and their determined adherence to the plainest of styles, makes their narrative oddly unexciting when compared, say, with Mrs. Gaskell's. As has become customary among biographers of the Brontës, they approach Emily through her poems (some 20 of their 332 pages of text are devoted to quotations from Emily's poetry) and Charlotte through her letters. It seems bold to claim that Anne here receives her 'first full-length study' (p. vi), since Professor Will T. Hale's *Anne Brontë: Her Life and Writings* (1929) is cited in the Supplementary Bibliography. The Hansons have most that is fresh to say about Branwell. They show convincingly, for example, that his involvement with Mrs. Robinson must after all be taken seriously, no matter how irresistibly his bathetic letters may remind one of Dick Swiveller's little affair with Miss Sophy Wackles.

Literary criticism is not the Hansons' *forte*. Occasionally they achieve a fresh formulation in their discussion of the novels (e.g. in their account of the different ways in which association with Branwell influenced his sisters in their fiction), but for the most part they are content to provide competent summaries of received opinion. On one point they must be charged with a perverse insistence upon misreading the literary filiation of Charlotte's novels. In 1840 Charlotte spent part of the summer examining a 'bale of French books' lent her by a friend.<sup>1</sup> No positive evidence regarding the authorship of these books has transpired, and ten years later Charlotte declared that Balzac was 'quite a new author' to her.<sup>2</sup> The Hansons are aware of these facts.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless they are confident not only that she read Balzac in 1840, but also that his 'acute psychological studies compelled the admiration of one whose genius was inclining towards the same subtle method of portraiture'.<sup>4</sup> When one considers that to English readers of the eighteen-forties Balzac was merely one more purveyor of romantic sensationalism of the stamp of Soulié and Sue,<sup>5</sup> not the great realist that we today conceive him to be, this argument seems the flimsiest and most unlikely of speculations. The Hansons might have profited here by the example of May Sinclair, who advanced a similar theory in her text, only to withdraw it in a downright footnote: 'I am wrong. Charlotte did not read Balzac till later, when George Henry Lewes told her to.'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T. J. Wise and J. A. Symington, *The Brontës: Their Lives, Friendships and Correspondence* (Oxford, 1932), i. 215.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 358.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., iii. 172.  
<sup>4</sup> p. 77. The Hansons, apparently through inadvertence, repeat their argument on p. 87 with the same supporting evidence.

<sup>5</sup> See Marcel Moraud, *Le Romantisme français en Angleterre de 1814 à 1848* (Paris, 1933), pp. 378-95.

<sup>6</sup> *The Three Brontës* (London, 1912), p. 115.

But a review of so good a book should not end upon a cavil. In respect of inclusiveness and precision of documentation the Hansons' study lifts biographical scholarship concerning the Brontës to a new level. They have thus earned for themselves a place among the small group of distinguished Brontë students mentioned earlier, to whom all those interested in Victorian fiction will long be grateful.

GORDON N. RAY

**The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature.** Edited by JOSEPH E. BAKER. Pp. ix+236. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. \$3.75; 24s. net.

This symposium, edited for the Victorian Literature Group of the M.L.A., consists of eleven essays by American scholars and *littérateurs*, chosen by a committee of five Victorian specialists, three of whom are also contributors. In 'The Critical Study of the Victorian Age', the shortest essay in the collection, Mr. Norman Foerster traces the unease about modern methods of literary research that has led to the production of the book. In the middle 1930's the M.L.A. committee on Trends of Scholarship raised the question whether 'a reorientation of research is now due in this country, and overdue' and recognized that 'the last thing the mature teacher wants to do in most cases is to re-examine painfully and conscientiously the objectives of his work' (p. 64). 'If the younger scholars', comments Mr. Foerster, 'are to lead us away from aimless discoveries and unorganized compilations, they will have to destroy the curious notion built up in the Victorian period (largely in Germany) that sound scholarship is simply scientific method applied to literature'; and he sums up his argument by insisting: 'The center of the art of letters is forever value, aesthetic-ethical value, and consequently the end of scholarship is criticism' (p. 66). Such an attitude, for which one can suppose Matthew Arnold's spectral approval, raises expectations, which, unfortunately, are not fulfilled by the other contributors.

The essays included cover a wide range of topics from 'The Tradition of Burke' and 'The Victorians and the World Abroad' to 'Victorian Education and the Idea of Culture' and 'Our New Hellenic Renaissance'. Although the committee exercised a general supervision over the material to be published and most of the essays were given a final form only after careful discussion, Professor Baker points out in his preface that 'we have encouraged diversity of approach'; and, indeed, there is little unity in the collection beyond that furnished by a common desire to promote Victorian studies. Perhaps it is naïve to expect a reinterpretation of a whole phase of literary culture from a committee, but a standpoint of some kind might have been hoped for, and, along with it, the emergence, however tentatively and obscurely, of the outlines of a value-judgement about the nature of the Victorian achievement in poetry, drama, criticism, and the novel. Very little less is implicit in the isolation of the Victorian age as a subject of specialist literary study. For the most part, however, contributors have either accepted the traditional picture, so far as values are concerned, or avoided making judgements at all—the neglect of any discussion of Victorian

poetry is the oddest feature of the symposium—and turned, it would seem with relief, to making suggestions for future doctoral theses. 'Alexander Smith needs to be rediscovered' (p. 205), it is claimed, but has he ever been forgotten? And, if he has not, is it suggested that his qualities and weaknesses have been misconstrued? 'Investigation of (1) the critical attitudes adopted by various major nineteenth-century magazines in dealing with foreign literature and (2) the relative amount of space given over to foreign matters, literary and otherwise', it is argued in another place, 'should produce information of considerable interest to students of the Victorian era' (p. 189). This may be so, but it is highly questionable whether such investigations are capable of promoting any radical reinterpretation of the period as a whole. The title of the book, then, is somewhat misleading.

Once this general failure is admitted, it is possible to find instruction and interest in the symposium. Professor E. Neff writes usefully on 'Social Background and Social Thought'. The late Professor C. F. Harrold reconsiders the Oxford Movement. In 'New Territories in Victorian Biography' Professor J. W. Dodds defines very well not only what remains to be done and what must be done again, but how we should set about it. The editor himself is stimulating in riding a hobby-horse on the debt of the Victorians to the Greeks. Other articles are less happy. Perhaps Mr. W. S. Knickerbocker's elementary survey of English education in the nineteenth century may be useful to students in America, but the story has already been told almost too many times. In 'Form and Technique in the Novel' Mr. Bradford A. Booth reveals, apart from some uncertainty in the use of pronouns, a distressing Light Programme approach to Victorian fiction:

But after *Waverley* there was a tremendous middle-class public ever alert for a rattling good story. When Scott exhibited a gallery of hard-hitting characters amid the gorgeous panoply of romance, he did more than widen the field of the novel. . . . Poetry plus passion is a simple sum that has always equalled tragedy, and with the Brontës, particularly Emily, English fiction began to reach the deeper emotions (pp. 68, 88).

The article by Howard Mumford Jones on 'The Comic Spirit and Victorian Sanity' is inexcusable. A footnote records that the substance of this essay, under the title 'Those Eminent Victorians', appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* in February 1933.

KENNETH ALLOTT

**The Golden Nightingale. Essays on Some Principles of Poetry in the Lyrics of William Butler Yeats.** By DONALD A. STAUFFER. Pp. vi+165. London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 22s. 6d. net.

The great merit of Professor Stauffer's five essays upon Yeats is that he has restricted himself to answering certain questions, believing that a book purporting to cover Yeats's achievement completely would be a mistake, for it would suggest that limits had been set to that which is inexhaustible. What he has done is to evolve some principles of poetry from a study of Yeats, whom he considers the greatest poet of his time, and to write criticism which is fresh,

direct, and useful. It is useful because its discussion of poetry in general (and Yeats's in particular) places Yeats properly in perspective and weighs up his achievement with authority; direct because he has left aside biographical and literary sources, concentrating upon the critical essays and the lyric poems of Yeats's maturity; and fresh because its author brings to his task an imaginative mind and the integrity to record his reactions in full.

The discussion of Yeats's ideas and the significance of *A Vision* in the first chapter, and the examination of his use of symbolism in the second, are both good introductions to and expositions of Yeats as a poet, and are more than a defence of the poet's unusual thought and technique. The third chapter, 'The Reading of a Lyric', reviews Yeats's methods of distilling passion into 'lyrical stasis' and examines 'The Wild Swans at Coole' in some detail. In this essay several important points are made: the skill of Yeats in linking stanzas by subtle repetitions; his ability to remodel a common image and give it a new power; and the need for 'some knowledge of at least the main body of his poems' in order that single poems may be appreciated and more fully understood. The dismissal of the plays in this chapter seems to come from the study rather than the auditorium. The fourth essay examines the purpose of poetry and finds in Yeats a desire to experience the fullness of life, to pursue the object of delight with an implicit morality as well as with the mischief which Professor Stauffer very properly appreciates in Yeats. The final chapter 'plans to tell what this book is not trying to do and then to tell what this book has tried to do'.

Professor Stauffer has restricted himself, but in the midst of his restricted area there emerges a wish to press the accelerator and turn to the open road of fuller inquiry into the meaning of the poems. The author is the first to realize this, particularly in his study of 'The Wild Swans at Coole', where he states that 'another almost unescapable approach is the filling in of biography; the question is naturally roused by the poem and only the pure theorist will brush it aside'. But he has eschewed biography and chosen a position for himself half-way between pure criticism and a fuller literary biographical approach. Pure criticism alone is not the answer if one wants to find out what Yeats intended to convey in a poem (as Professor Stauffer shows by his discussion of the light *A Vision* sheds upon the poetry); yet the top-hamper of sources, personal and literary, may well prove too heavy for sailing in the swell of personal criticism. Professor Stauffer has managed to match his own creative response with an attempt to discover what Yeats meant; he has chosen the right sail area for his purpose; his breezy style makes progress because it tautens equally the Yeats mainsail and the Stauffer spinnaker.

The winds of criticism blow from many quarters. *Responsibilities* was once viewed by sensitive critics (very reasonably, since they could not foresee at the time that Yeats had undergone a poetic rebirth) as marking the end of Yeats's poetry. Professor Stauffer writes:

A reader will not have missed much except the pious pleasure of knowing all there is to know about a friend, if he begins his reading with *Responsibilities* (1914) and carries on through the five volumes that follow.

The critics who thought *Responsibilities* the end had grown up with the music of the early idealistic verse in their ears, and to them the new style seemed desecration: those who began to read Yeats after the glow of the twilight had sunk below the horizon see the beginning of maturity in the cold dawn light of *Responsibilities* and tend to dismiss the early work. But they are not seeing the wholeness of Yeats's achievement. Elsewhere in this book Professor Stauffer asks for some knowledge at least of the body of Yeats's work, and he utilizes a poem of 1904 in order better to understand the meaning of 'The Wild Swans at Coole', a poem of 1919; he realizes and explains very well the need to examine the relationships between poems, but this must be done right through Yeats's career. There is a pattern in his development. The new style begins in the volume before *Responsibilities*, *The Green Helmet and Other Poems* (1910) (biographical study, particularly of the diaries, reinforces this; besides, to neglect *The Green Helmet* is to throw away some of the best love poetry Yeats ever wrote), whereas it does not seem to have become fully positive till *The Wild Swans at Coole* (1919), a volume built firmly upon the foundations of *A Vision*, and upon the self-confidence due to it which allowed Yeats to put everything into his poetry, even decoration once more. *Responsibilities* is in part a clearing of the ground, as much a negation of the early work as an establishment of the new nakedness.

There is plenty of good poetry in Yeats's nineteenth-century work, and obviously his Irish background needs yet more investigation. Much of the later poetry is intimately related to the early work. There was nothing beyond the mists, but much of what Yeats dreamed within them he brought out into the sunlight and moonlight of his later writing—in particular his love of the physical scene of Ireland, the symbols of trees, lakes, hills, winds, and clouds. Many of the critical essays that Professor Stauffer quotes were written in the nineties, when Yeats was writing *fin de siècle* poetry in his most languorous and languishing style, and they often overstate his case, as the contemporary poetry overdid its dreaming unreality. One occasionally suspects that Professor Stauffer has accepted the urn of Yeats's poetic theory without examining it for flaws. There are a few cracks here and there, but they do not detract from the beauty of its workmanship: the theories, like the poems, are the work of an undoubted genius. Above all we must be grateful to Professor Stauffer for his insistence that Yeats is both natural and cultivated in his strength and sweetness.

A. NORMAN JEFFARES

**English Poetry.** An illustrated catalogue of first and early editions exhibited in 1947 at 7 Albemarle Street, London. Compiled and revised by JOHN HAYWARD. Pp. 10+148+190 plates. Published for the National Book League by the Cambridge University Press. £4. 4s. net.

It was a laudable project of the National Book League in 1947 to arrange a comprehensive exhibition of early editions of English poetry from Chaucer to the present time, and few could have been so successful in carrying it through as Mr. John Hayward, who was responsible for the selection, acquisition, and

cataloguing of the exhibits. Owing to the limitations of space it was necessary to confine the exhibition rigidly to original English poetry, thus excluding miscellanies as well as dramatic, translated, and Scottish verse. Moreover, in most cases an author could be represented only by a single volume. Most of the books were displayed in those editions in which they first appeared, and Mr. Hayward is to be congratulated on having secured the interest and co-operation of sixty private collectors, ten booksellers, eight College libraries, and the Corporation of the City of London.

The Catalogue originally compiled for the exhibition is now reissued with six pages of additions and corrections together with illustrations of all the title-pages. The 346 reproductions make it unnecessary, just as it was when the Catalogue was first issued and the books themselves on view, to make any attempt to describe the typographical arrangement of the title-pages. All titles in the text have therefore been standardized, but full details are generally provided of the copy in question—its size, edition, and issue, with a note of its binding and provenance.

Admirable as the Catalogue is, it must be recorded that the reproductions are disappointing. The few in collotype will pass muster, but many of the others are unsatisfactory owing to blurring. The paper also is unpleasantly white (Caxton's eyesight, it will be remembered, was impaired by 'overmochē lokyng on whit paper'). It is to be regretted that at a time when important experiments are being made to improve the processes of facsimile illustration the better results which could be obtained are now often beyond our reach because of steadily increasing prices. To photograph and reproduce 346 items was necessarily an ambitious undertaking.

The bibliographical value of the Catalogue would have been enhanced if the measurements of the originals had been added to the reproductions, and if collations or references to collations had been consistently given. *Days and Hours* (1889) is described as Arthur Symons's first book. It was his first book of verse, but had been preceded three years earlier by *An Introduction to the Study of Browning*.

STRICKLAND GIBSON

**English Studies 1949.** Collected for the English Association by SIR PHILIP MAGNUS. Pp. vi+90. London: John Murray, 1949. 8s. 6d. net.

Two articles which have little or nothing to do with English studies fill rather more than a quarter of this volume. In 'The Character and Private Life of Edmund Burke', Sir Philip Magnus writes interestingly and at length of the politician and his finances, mentioning the author and his works only briefly and by the way; and Mr. Hugh Lyon, in his pedagogic ruminations entitled 'Hit or Miss', finds it unnecessary to refer to literature at all. The five other contributions are genuine English studies, though of widely varying merit. But taken as a whole the volume does not illustrate any clear conception of the characteristic preoccupations and necessary limits of English studies. It is regrettable that its apparently aimless eclecticism should have the official sanction of the English Association.

The more valuable of the five strictly literary essays are contributions to literary history and the history of ideas. Thus, in 'Ben Jonson and the Seventeenth Century', Mr. L. J. Potts offers an explanation of Jonson's dominant influence upon English poetry between Donne and Wordsworth. He argues that Jonson was able to exert this influence because he was a thoroughgoing Baconian who was perfectly willing to make poetry the servant of science. Mr. Potts supports his case by ample quotation, more especially from *Timber*, and suggests how Jonson's serious, responsible, craftsmanlike, and somewhat prosaic conception of poetry is related to his general outlook. At a time when it is fashionable to think of the great men of the English Renaissance as looking back to the Middle Ages, it is particularly refreshing to meet this careful and sensitive presentation of Jonson as one who 'never hesitated to look forward'.

Mr. R. L. Brett, in 'Coleridge's Theory of the Imagination', accepts Coleridge's assertions that he was not indebted to Kant for his beliefs about the poetic imagination and shows how he could have arrived at these beliefs from a study of the Cambridge Platonist Ralph Cudworth and the philosophical tradition which he represents. Mr. Brett maintains very persuasively that it was from such sources that Coleridge derived his view of the natural world as bodied forth by the continuous creative activity of a Divine Imagination and as being in consequence a complex of symbols expressive of the Divine Mind. From this it was for Coleridge a short step to the view that the poetic mind expresses itself in a strictly analogous fashion by means of the aesthetic symbolism created by its imaginative activity. Indeed, as Mr. Brett points out, Coleridge several times explicitly compares the poetic imagination with the divine act of creation.

Mr. Colin J. Horne, in 'Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*', celebrates one of our classical anthologies. He gives a useful account of its genesis and writes a warm appreciation of its virtues. Mr. Horne does not ignore the fact that, thanks to its prolonged popularity, the *Golden Treasury* has had a restrictive effect upon literary taste, helping to fix the notion that true poetry is necessarily sweet and singable. But he points out that Palgrave himself is only partly responsible for this result and rightly insists upon the important educational service which has been rendered by the work.

The two remaining essays refer principally to contemporary literature. In 'The Prose of E. R. Eddison', Mr. G. Rostrevor Hamilton makes high claims for his subject. 'Eddison has obvious faults—incongruities, lapses of taste, mannerisms which are now and then irritating: on the other hand, in his towering fantasy, the sweep of his invention and the grandeur of his style, I find something more than high talent—a vein of genius, setting him apart as one of the most remarkable writers of our age.' After this, the pieces of lurid fine writing which he quotes come with the shock of anticlimax.

In 'You Might Have Rimed', Mr. E. H. W. Meyerstein claims James Macpherson as the founder of modern free verse. He works out his case with allusions to over fifty other writers, packing them in with some dexterity. But he quotes no examples of the modern free verse which he believes to be in the line of descent from Macpherson. True, he does go so far as to name *Praefrock* and *Mauberley*. But *Mauberley* resulted from its author's belief that it was time for

a reaction *against* free verse; and it does on the whole approximate to the 'Rhyme and regular strophes' which Mr. Pound prescribed [*Polite Essays* (London, 1937), p. 14]. Mr. Meyerstein holds that the 'best long poem of our time is *The Testament of Beauty*'. But his reference even to this is unfortunate. In quoting Bridges's description of its measure as 'loose alexandrines', he goes to the *T.L.S.* review for a phrase which he could have found in the poem itself (Book II, line 841). Mr. Meyerstein is over-eager to belittle modern free verse by asserting that there is nothing new in it; he offers no evidence, apart from a general appeal to the 'prosodic ear', in confirmation of the particular relationship he wishes to establish; and he shows no awareness of the genuinely free verse of D. H. Lawrence, Mr. Pound himself, and others.

J. D. JUMP

**The London Book of English Verse.** Selected by HERBERT READ and BONAMY DOBRÉE. Pp. xxxv+874. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1949. 12s. 6d. net.

Of making of anthologies there is no end—sæve that imposed by disillusioned publishers, who from time to time resolve to print no more. Such a time, I gather, is just now, and it would have been a risk to publish *The London Book of English Verse* in 1949 had not its editors been two men who had already won golden opinions by their book of English prose, certainly the best of its kind. Professor Dobrée and Mr. Read have now made an excellent verse-collection which should have a wide sale.

Each generation tends to have the anthology it deserves, which expresses the aesthetic standards of its period. Thus Palgrave's *Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*, in which the collector was aided by Tennyson, embodied the cultural standards of 1861, with its interest in song, ballads, the romantic note, its dislike of the 'Metaphysical', the Augustans, its ignorance of the early sixteenth century, its fear of offending the living by applying to them the criteria aimed at in the collection. Because it was a small book intended not only for the *cognoscenti* but as 'a storehouse of delight to Labour and to Poverty', the *Golden Treasury* had not room for a lavish display of errors of judgement. Fortunately for literary criticism there is usually a large measure of agreement about the best poems; disagreement increases in judging the second best, the marginal or eccentric talent.

Quiller-Couch in *The Oxford Book of English Verse* in 1900 embodied the taste of his own generation, including living poets in his thousand pages with a broad tolerance that admired the tenuous sensibility and vague humanitarianism which the late Victorians handed on to the 'Georgians'.

A virile, self-assured age can accept large emotional generalities and a lack of definition which a weaker, more introspective age cannot stomach and therefore dubs 'pathological'. Our new anthologists speak rightly of a 'shift in sensibility' which makes them deplore 'the pathological condition of sentimentality that set in about 1810 (Moore, Mrs. Hemans) and lasts until 1914 (Dowson, Flecker, and the "Georgians" generally)'. This makes them ignore much excellent work of the present century, which does not bulk large in their scheme. In choosing from the past their taste is not so limited.

In an interesting Introduction the editors point out that their search for 'essential poetry' is intuitive and definable negatively rather than positively. On the whole, I should say, their general principle is that which has underlain much of the best poetry of our time: it is 'imager'. Of course they delight in the poetry of profound imaginative resonance which is universal in appeal; they are unusually sensitive also to the poetry where every line is a concrete symbol, and the images are hard, bright counters. They love clear, precise emotions, and the play of wit that often defines these. Hence they give us lavishly of Elizabethan and Metaphysical lyric and almost enough of the Augustans.

Formal 'Imagism', though a fruitful convention, was a narrow creed, and the great virtue of this anthology is that it reflects the broadening which has liberated poetry and criticism since the days of T. E. Hulme (two of whose poems are given here). 'Pure poetry', as Mr. Dobrée and Mr. Read declare, is an absolute, and it is significant that they seek it as partially embodied in material forms, as approximated through the mundane preoccupations that inspire the poets and colour the resultant poetry. Hence they go beyond Palgrave and 'Q' in giving many more examples of the contemplative and epistolary, for 'It is one of the characteristic achievements of English verse that it has demonstrated the poetic value of the conversational rhythm and tone'.

They have departed from 'Q's' chronological arrangement by order of authors, and from Palgrave's arrangement in periods. But they owe something to Palgrave's grouping in 'gradations of feeling and of subject', and go far beyond his tentative placing of poems out of their centuries. The poems are grouped in Books according to the poetic aims of authors: narrative, song, lyrics of mood, lyrics of fancy and curious meditation, objective description, subjective description, moralistic verse, metaphysical verse, symphonic poems, satires, and light verse. We can only admire the often exquisite modulations of feeling achieved by such grouping within the ten Books. Where so much is given it would be ungracious to look for much more, or to complain at the omission of individual poems congenial to the reviewer. But I wish there had been more of that descriptive verse verging on the argumentative and didactic in which the Elizabethan and Augustan ages excelled, and more satire and epigram. However, the line below which 'essential poetry' ceases to be observed must inevitably vary with each explorer. Undoubtedly this is the best of general verse-anthologies, and a sheer delight to read.

GEOFFREY BULLOUGH

### SHORT NOTICES

**Edmund Spenser and *The Faerie Queen*.** By LEICESTER BRADNER. Pp. xi+190. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948. 15s. net.

In this book, intended for the general reader rather than the scholar, Spenser is presented not as a contemplative dreamer but as an active public official, and his master-work as 'not a museum-piece but a living criticism of life'. The records of Spenser's career and the content of his writings give ample justification for such an approach, which would seem

to be even necessary if the term 'poet's poet' is still to bear any meaning. Mr. Bradner writes with the knowledge and enthusiasm to be expected from a Spenserian of long standing and the Chairman of the Spenser Allusion Book Committee, and his book, while obviously planned on the general lines of the American university curriculum, should prove helpful to any student requiring a broad survey of Spenser's life and achievement against the background of the Elizabethan scene. This applies particularly to the three introductory chapters dealing with Spenser's life and poetic methods, with special reference to *The Shepheardes Calender* and the character of Colin Clout. The section on *The Faerie Queene* consists largely of a critical summary of the plot, more useful to the student who is actually working on the poem than stimulating to one who is not. The restrictions of a brief, popular study allow little space for the discussion of debatable points, but even so one cannot but feel that Mr. Bradner may mislead some readers into accepting as facts hypotheses which, if plausible, are still unproven as, for instance, that of Spenser's early marriage and of the reconstruction of *The Faerie Queene*. The order of Chapters IV and V—'The Narrative Poet (*Faerie Queene*, III-v)' and 'The Allegorist (*Faerie Queene*, I-ii)'—follows the authority not of Spenser but of Mrs. Josephine Bennett, and the arbitrary grouping of specific books under narrative and allegory tends to obscure what is common to them all as part of a single continuous poem in which the elements of narrative and allegory are interfused. The omission of all reference to Spenser's use of Aristotle, though doubtless deliberate, seems an unnecessary simplification, and the appended letter to Raleigh is termed 'prefatory'. With these qualifications the book can be recommended as likely to fulfil the purpose for which it is designed.

B. E. C. DAVIS

**De Dödas Uppror: Ett Omvälvat Textställe i Macbeth.** Av H. W. DONNER. Pp. 13. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1949.

**Svenska Översättningar av Shakespeare's Macbeth.** Av H. W. DONNER. Pp. viii+148. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1950. No price given.

In the first of these, reprinted from a volume presented to Professor Rolf Pipping on his sixtieth birthday, Mr. Donner argues in favour of the Folio reading at iv. i. 97, 'Rebellious dead', in preference to Theobald's 'Rebellion's head'. He draws a striking parallel with Brutus's

Caesar, now be still;  
I killed not thee with half so good a will.

and, in general, presents a case which carries conviction.

The other volume represents the first section of Mr. Donner's ambitious study of the Swedish versions of *Macbeth*, and is concerned with the translation made in 1812 by Erik Gustav Geijer. In this patiently conducted and well-documented piece of research Mr. Donner examines Geijer's debt to Schiller. Unfortunately this is the kind of inquiry that inevitably lacks interest for other than Scandinavian readers.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

**Byron's Lyrics.** By L. C. MARTIN. Pp. 25 (Byron Foundation Lecture, 24).

**Byron and Switzerland.** By HEINRICH STRAUMANN. Pp. 26 (Byron Foundation Lecture, 25). Nottingham: University Library. Each 1s. 6d. net.

The Byron Foundation Lectures at the University of Nottingham, of which these lectures, delivered in 1948 and 1949, are Nos. 24 and 25, enable scholars to consider single phases of Byron's genius or writings. Professor Martin concentrates on what may loosely be called the 'lyrical' poetry, and in particular on the artistry of verse form and diction. Egotism and facility were serious hindrances to Byron's achievement, but when his theme took him away from himself, or when the chosen form provided some technical difficulty

to check the headlong torrent of words, his poetry acquired an elemental and universal quality. He was at his best when he was moved to write, in the grand, simple style, on the dignified themes of endurance, or liberty, or man's power to rise above his mortal nature. The literary creation of the stupendous heroic personality has distracted attention overmuch, so that the emphasis upon the art of Byron in verse makes this essay valuable. The analysis is clear, and the illustrations are admirably chosen.

Professor Straumann, of Zurich, has two main themes, an account of Byron's residence and tours in Switzerland in 1816, and a study, like ever-widening rings in water, of the effect of Swiss scenery and life upon the poetry. With illustrations from *The Prisoner of Chillon* and *Manfred* attention is directed, in a clear and careful analysis, to the motives from which the great poetry grew—nature, solitude, death and immortality, and the heroic in spirit and action. Professor Schaumann finds the dualistic attitude fundamental in Byron's mind. He could be laudatory and bitter about the same object, almost at the same time. Human greatness appears so frequently connected with suffering, and in his greatest poems conception and image are commonly in contrast. Liberty is beheld through prison bars, silence is emphasized by the carol of a bird, the prisoner aching with his desire for freedom is reconciled with his loneliness. The dissection of Byron's mind is skilfully conducted, and in its brief compass the lecture is illuminating and suggestive.

W. D. THOMAS

**A List of the Published Writings of Percy Simpson.** Pp. 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. 5s. net.

Everybody who has met and known Dr. Percy Simpson, whether in person or in print, will wish to possess this handsome pamphlet, with its choice vivid seven-page biography and its bibliography. It is a well-managed tribute to a long devotion to English studies, which happily is still going strong.

What we envy Dr. Simpson most is his unrivalled familiarity with the literature and especially the poetry and drama of the hundred years that straddle across 1600, and with that literature as printed or, where possible, as written down by its author. Dr. Simpson's reading life has already lasted almost as long as his chosen period, and we see it enviously as spent in those few best libraries where he has read to understand (and also to enjoy with gusto and a quiet affection) and whence he has emerged with spirit to interpret what he has come to understand. As his anonymous biographer(s) see, Dr. Simpson has always paid the authors he read the compliment of believing they were men who, like himself, wrote sense, and like himself avoided writing nonsense. Where their intentions were faithfully served by their compositors (which was often) Dr. Simpson has always been keen on renewing their clearness. Often his work is that of guarding an original sense against a Goth—whether Father Time or an editor ignorant as dirt. What he hates most, one suspects, is the well-meaning emendation of the beautifully right. Perhaps his most characteristic article is that on the 'headless bear': the poor blue-eyed critic who had ventured to emend this to 'heedless bear' had his epithet converted into a sword and thrust into his vitals.

After reading the bibliography, admirers of Dr. Simpson who are not Oriel men will now see the need of consulting the files of the *Oriel Record*, where they will find work of Dr. Simpson as unexpected by some of them as his substantial review of *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

### BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER

Vol. xxxiii, No. 2, March 1951

'In the quick forge and working-house of thought. . . .' Lancashire and Shropshire and the young Shakespeare (Allan Keen), pp. 256-70.

### DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xii, No. 2, March 1951

Joseph Butler: moralist (Winston H. F. Barnes), pp. 37-48.

An unpublished letter from Paine to Burke (J. T. Boulton), pp. 49-55.

Donne and the 'New Philosophy' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 61-4.

### ELH

Vol. xviii, No. 1, March 1951

Chaucer's clerks and the Mediaeval scholarly tradition as represented by Richard de Bury's 'Philobiblon' (A. Wigfall Green), pp. 1-6.

Samuel Butler: a Restoration figure in a modern light (Ricardo Quintana), pp. 7-31.

De Quincey's dramaturgic criticism (John E. Jordan), pp. 32-49.

Yeats' last plays: an interpretation (Donald R. Pearce), pp. 67-76.

### ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxii, No. 1, February 1951

Echoes in *The Waste Land* (Giorgio Melchiori), pp. 1-11.

*Shall you? or Will you?* ? Second-person questions relating to the future (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 11-23.

Notes on *Ein mittelenglisches Medizinbuch* (Chr. Stapelkamp), pp. 24-9.

'Fat and scant of breath' again (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 29-30.

*Comedy of Errors*, III. i. 64-5 (J. C. Maxwell), p. 30.

Points of Modern English syntax (P. A. Erades), pp. 42-7.

[Continued *ibid.* xxxii. 93-6.]

Vol. xxxii, No. 2, April 1951

Old English *æ ~ a* (Alan S. C. Ross), pp. 49-56.

The setting of *The Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo* (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 56-62.

The dramatic delivery of Shakespeare's verse (R. B. le Page), pp. 63-8.

Alliterative assonance in Harley Ms. 2253 (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 68-70.

'werre and wrake and wonder' (*Sir Gawain*, l. 16) (Adrien Bonjour), pp. 70-2.

Keats's letter to Tom of July 3-9, 1818 (Georges A. Bonnard), pp. 72-6.

Cockney 'What are you doing of?' (F. Th. Visser), pp. 76-7.

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xiv, No. 2, February 1951

*MacFlecknoe* and Cowley's *Davideis* (A. L. Korn), pp. 99-127.  
 Milton and Sir John Stradling (Malcolm Mackenzie Ross), pp. 129-46.  
 The 1641 edition of Chapman's *Busy D'Ambois* (Berta Sturman), pp. 171-201.  
 A dunce objects to Pope's dictatorship (Maurice M. Shudofsky), pp. 203-7.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxvi, No. 1, January 1951

Toward an understanding of Wordsworth's *The Borderers* (Donald Hayden), pp. 1-6.  
 Richard Steele and the Drury Lane management (John Loftis), pp. 7-11.  
 Christ's miraculous fast (George W. Whiting), pp. 12-16.  
 [In *Paradise Regained*.]  
 Thomas Heywood and the Low Countries (Allan Holaday), pp. 16-19.  
 Plautus' *Persa* and Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (Signi Falk), pp. 19-21.  
 Notes on Malory's sources (Robert H. Wilson), pp. 22-6.  
 Five Notes on Chaucer and Froissart (Roland M. Smith), pp. 27-32.  
 'Marerez, mysse' in *The Pearl* (C. Hugh Holman), pp. 33-6.  
 Two notes on *Beowulf* (Fritz Mezger), pp. 36-8.  
 [ll. 446, 253.]  
 A note on *Hamlet* (Ruth Huff Cline), p. 40.  
 [v. ii. 193.]

Vol. lxvi, No. 2, February 1951

Unedited letters by Sterne, Hume, and Rousseau (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 73-80.  
 Dryden's letter to 'Ormond' (Pierre Legouis), pp. 88-92.  
 A source for Wordsworth's sonnet, 'The Black Stones of Iona' (Charles Norton Coe), p. 102.

Vol. lxvi, No. 3, March 1951

Sir Walter Scott and the Pictish question (Roland M. Smith), pp. 175-80.  
 Robert Hooke and *The Virtuoso* (Everett L. Jones), pp. 180-2.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. xlvi, No. 4, October 1950

'Piers Plowman': the Pardon reconsidered (John Lawlor), pp. 449-58.  
 The textual problem of 'Troilus and Cressida' (Alice Walker), pp. 459-64.  
 Some notes on More's 'Utopia' in Spain (Royston O. Jones), pp. 478-82.  
 The Elizabethan pronunciation of accented Greek words (Percy Simpson), pp. 509-10.  
 Spenser's letter to Ralegh (W. J. B. Owen), pp. 511-12.  
 A Spanish Hamlet (John Robert Moore), p. 512.

302 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Killigrew's use of Donne in 'The Parson's Wedding' (William R. Keast), pp. 512-15.  
'Paradise Lost', xi. 829-38 (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 515-16.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. *xlviii*, No. 3, February 1951

Arthur and the Romano-Celtic frontier (J. C. Russell), pp. 145-53.  
The occasion and date of Sir Thomas Browne's *A Letter to a Friend* (Frank Livingstone Huntley), pp. 157-71.  
Did Sterne complete *Tristram Shandy*? (Wayne Booth), pp. 172-83.  
Lambeth and Bethlehem in Blake's *Jerusalem* (David V. Erdman), pp. 184-92.  
The sophistification of W. H. Auden. A sketch in Longinian method (Robert Roth), pp. 193-204.  
Dryden studies, 1895-1948 (W. R. Keast), pp. 205-10.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

35ste Jaarg., Afl. 1, 1 Januari 1951

Chaucer's 'for the nones' (R. M. Lumiansky), pp. 29-36.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN (Helsinki)

Vol. *lii*, Nos. 1-2, 28 Februar 1951

Healfdenes Tochter (Ernst Ochs), pp. 29-30.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. *cxcvi*, No. 3, 3 February 1951

Infinite riches: a note on Marlovian unity (Nan Cooke Carpenter), pp. 50-2.  
Did Shakespeare use Daniel's 'Civile Warres'? (C. A. Greer), pp. 53-4.  
Further emendations in 'The Tempest' (Howard Parsons), pp. 54-5.

Vol. *cxcvi*, No. 4, 17 February 1951

'The Unfortunate Traveller' of Thomas Nashe as a sidelight on Elizabethan security (J. B. Hunter), pp. 75-6.  
Bibliographical notices of 'The Last Battell of the Soule in Death' (1628-29) (J. L. Weir), pp. 76-8.  
[Continued from *N. & Q.* *cxcv*. 537.]  
A Johnson conversation (A. D. Atkinson), p. 79.  
A source for Wordsworth's 'Effusion in the Pleasure-Ground' (Charles Norton Coe), pp. 80-1.  
Dickens and the Horn Tavern, Fleet Street (Arthur W. Marks), p. 81.

Vol. *cxcvi*, No. 5, 3 March 1951

King Cambises' vein (Abraham Feldman), pp. 98-100.  
[*Cambises, King of Persia*, by Thomas Preston.]

Vol. *cxcvi*, No. 6, 17 March 1951

Satire of Wolsey in Heywood's 'Play of Love' (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 112-14.

Una's lion: a folklore analogue (Irving Ribner), pp. 114-15.  
 A Virgilian echo in Marvell (Kenneth Muir), p. 115.  
 Milton and Sir Philip Sidney's 'Arcadia' (Ephim G. Fogel), pp. 115-17.  
 Thomas Chatterton, De Burgham, and John Dix (Arthur Waldhorn), pp. 120-1.  
 'The Poet's Eye' (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 121-2.  
 [Keats's imagery.]  
 Charles Dickens and Thomas C. Evans. A proposed Reading Tour in the U.S.A.—1859 (K. J. Fielding), pp. 123-4.

## Vol. cxvii, No. 7, 31 March 1951

Palden's Middle-English prayer (R. H. Bowers), p. 134.  
 An uncollected poem of John Skelton (?) (James G. McManaway), pp. 134-5.  
 'Ralph Roister Doister' and the little eyases (Herbert T. Webster), pp. 135-6.  
 '“Veal”, quoth the Dutchman' (E. S. Fussell), pp. 136-7.  
 [Love's Labour's Lost, v. ii. 247.]  
 Influence of Wordsworth's 'Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey' upon Keats's 'Ode to a Nightingale' (Charles L. Rivers), pp. 142-3.  
 A note on Keats's 'To Autumn' (George W. Hartung), p. 143.  
 Beckford's dwarf and 'Don Juan', v. lxxxvii-xciv (Peter Ure), pp. 143-4.  
 Bolingbroke in Johnson's 'Dictionary' (D. J. Greene), p. 148.  
 William Richardson's Essays on Shakespeare (1784): a bibliographical note on the first edition (Francesco Cordasco), p. 148.  
 Gibbon cites Johnson (D. J. Greene), p. 148.

## Vol. cxvii, No. 8, 14 April 1951

The evolution of 'Chevy Chase' and 'The Battle of Otterburn' (D. S. Bland), pp. 160-1.  
 An unrecorded parody of Gray's 'Elegy' (Francesco Cordasco), p. 161.  
 Blake's Mr. Mathew (H. M. Margoliouth), pp. 162-3.  
 A Byron plagiarism from Dryden (Terence Spencer), p. 164.  
 King Lear, II. iv. 170 (Kenneth Muir), p. 170.

## Vol. cxvii, No. 9, 28 April 1951

Hamlet and Dante's Paradiso (W. Lawrence Thompson), pp. 181-2.  
 A new allusion in Gray's Elegy? (H. W. Jones), pp. 184-5.  
 Notes on Bulwer-Lytton's classical scholarship (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 191-2.  
 Fleeming Jenkin (1883-1885) (Editor), p. 193.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

## Vol. lxvi, No. 2, March 1951

Toward a theory of romanticism (Morse Peckham), pp. 5-23.  
 Organic unity: Leibniz to Coleridge (James Benziger), pp. 24-48.

Joyce's use of Da Ponte and Mozart's *Don Giovanni* (Vernon Hall, Jr.), pp. 78-84.

Henry James: the poetics of empiricism (John Henry Raleigh), pp. 107-23.

The structure of Newman's *Apologia* (Martin J. Svaglic), pp. 138-48.

Christopher North and the genesis of *The Raven* (William H. Gravely, Jr.), pp. 149-61.

Dr. Johnson on Fielding and Richardson (Robert Etheridge Moore), pp. 162-81.

The Blenheim Papers and Steele's journalism, 1715-18 (John Loftis), pp. 197-210.

Defoe in Stoke Newington (Arthur Secord), pp. 211-25.

John Fletcher and the art of declamation (Eugene M. Waith), pp. 226-34.

Chaucer's satire of the pardoner (Alfred L. Kellogg and Louis A. Haselman), pp. 251-77.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. xlvi, No. 1, January 1951*

Milton among the Augustans: the Infernal Council (John Robert Moore), pp. 15-25.

Samuel Johnson and Dryden's *Du Fresnoy* (W. K. Wimsatt, Jr.), pp. 26-39.

Word and word-tune in Burns (A. M. Buchan), pp. 40-8.

The design of Coleridge's 'Dejection' (Stephen F. Fogle), pp. 49-55.

A Jacobin journal's view of Lord Byron (Wilfred S. Dowden), pp. 56-66.

Dickens' western tour and the Cairo legend (Gerald G. Grubb), pp. 87-97.

Conrad's Axel (Katherine Haynes Gatch), pp. 98-106.

## THE EAGLE

*Vol. liv, No. 238, January 1951*

Cambridge exercises in the seventeenth century (K. M. Burton), pp. 248-58.

## TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH

*Vol. ii, 1950*

The function of the proverbial monitory elements in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* (R. M. Lumiansky), pp. 5-48.

*Resolution and Independence*: Wordsworth's answer to Coleridge's *Dejection: An Ode* (George Wilbur Meyer), pp. 49-74.

, Jr.),

7-23.

.,

, Jr.),

), pp.

), pp.

6-34.

Hasel-

oore),

6-39.

6-66.

7-97.

8-58.

as and

ction: